

THE ENCOVNER AGAINST M. PARSONS,

BY
A REVIEWV OF HIS LAST
SOBER RECKONING, And his Exceptions
vrged in the TREATISE OF HIS
MITIGATION.

Wherein moreouer is inserted:

1. *A Confession of some Romanists, both concerning the particular Falsifications of principall Romanists, as Namely, BELLARMINE, SVAREZ, and others: As also concerning the Generall fraude of that Church, in corrupting of Authors.*
2. *A Confutation of Slaunders, which BELLARMINE vrged against Protestants.*
3. *A Performance of the Challenge, which Mr. PARSONS made, for the Examining of sixtie Fathers, cited by COCCIUS for proofe of Purgatorie; to shew thirtie one of them to haue beene either Apocrypha, or corrupted, or wrested,*
4. *A Censure of a late Pamphlet, Intituled, The Patterne of a Protestant, by one once termed the Moderate Answerer.*
5. *An handling of his Question of Mentall Equiuocation (After his boldnesse with the L. COOKE) vpon occasion of the most memorable, and feryed Yorkshire Case of Equiuocating; and of his raging against D. KINGS Sermon.*

Published by Authoritie.

IOB. 19. 2.

If Thou haue reproached me, and art not ashamed; you are fierce against me.

IOB. 6. 24.

If Teach me and I will hold my tongue; cause me to understand wherein I haue erred.

LONDON

Printed for IOHN BILL.

THE EPISTLE

which claufe were fignified the prefcribed Rules of Gods providence, and vfe of the means which he hath ordayned for mans preferuation; the neglect whereof is not *Confidence*, but *Presumption*, and, in very deed, that * *Mitte te deorsum*.

* ver. 9.

I neede not to fay much more, but that there daylie foundeth in the eares of our Land and State, the report of two Accidents, which, by the mercy of God, may be as it were, the found of two warning-pieces, to awake all out of deafe securitie; the one is the late barbarous and tragicall end of that puiffant French *King*; the other, that Acheronticall *Powder-plot*, the very belch of *Belzebub*: therefore will your Highneffe stand attent vnto the gracious voices of the Highest, and difpofe of your wayes accordingly. That which belongeth vnto me, I fhall neuer ceafe to performe, euen my humble prayers vnto God for his right hand of protection ouer you, both vnder, and after the moft happy gouernement of our moft gracious Soueraigne.

Our Lord Iefus preferue you to the glory of his fauing grace.

Your Highneffes in all du-

tifull Obferuance,

TH. MORTON.



To the Christian Reader.

IF peraduenture thou hast not knowne (good Reader) the booke which is inscribed, A sober and quiet Reckoning, wherein M. Parsons hath bespotted his Adversary T. M. with the blacke markes of Falsifications; I shall now desire thee to take some notice thereof, and to compare it with this

Encounter, and then to iudge what interest I may haue in that sayng, ^a Qui volens detrahit famam ex, nolens addit mercedi.

In the Reuiew of which Reckoning I called to minde a short^b History of a man, who farmed a custome and tallage, which was taken at a bridge of all such passengers as were either diseased, or else notoriously deformed: So it was that one, that passed ouer the bridge, who had *distortum vultum*, was called vpon to pay a peny; which the passenger refused to pay: The Toller caps the fellow, and with that perceiueth that he had an other disease on his head; called *Alopecia*, and therefore he demaundeth of the party an other peny; but the Trauailer resisteth, and struggleth with the Toller, yet being not able to make his part good, is laide along on the ground, where, by some disadvantage, he bewraied an other disease, which he called the *Hernia*, and thereupon was charged to pay a third peny: there was no remedy, the custome must be paid.

In some like sort shall my Reader (in the perusall of this Encounter) finde the matter to fall forth betweene me and M. Parsons, wherein may be obserued, that the more he contendeth and struggleth, the more he intangleth himselfe, and bewrayeth

^a Aug.

^b Lib. Verisimil.
Theolog. &c.
ex Gilb. Cogn.
lib. 1. Narrat.

THE EPISTLE

one, who labored to vndermine the right both of his Maiesties possessions, and of your future succession in this land : then whome this Age hath not found any Scribe more prompt and plausible, or yet a more perswasive and powerfull Inchaunter.

See his booke intituled Dolman, part. 2. cap. 5. & cap. 10.

See his Treatise of Three Conuerfions of England, in the Additions vpon the newes of the succession of the King of Scotland to the Crowne of England, num. 8. which Addition was printed, Anno 1603.

For it is he who once durst exclude, in his *Doleman*, the Royal line of *Henry* the seauenth from the Crown of this Kingdome, and interested the *Infanta of Spaine* in the right thereof; and yet found much credit with some : notwithstanding he, euen the same he, no sooner vnderstood of our *Kinges* peaceable and prosperous entrance into this land, and ioyfull establishment in his Throne, but forthwith changing his Copy, offered to giue an assurance, that *whatsoeuer had beene written or done by any Catholike, which with some might breede disgust, was directed only to the end that his Maestie might be a Catholike, before he should be a King.* Which two how can they consist? for either must he haue in the former abused his Mistris the *Infanta*, or in the later deluded our Soueraigne *King Iames*. He likewise in his *Mitigation* protested and promised loyall subiection in the behalfe of all Romanists, and was held a credible Proctor for his Clients; yet since, in this his last *Reckoning* (bringing in, as it were, a sharpe axe to behead Kings of a contrary profession) he proclaimeth that *none may be an head in Christian communion who is excommunicate*, and notwithstanding herein also he wanted not an applause; So potent a *Mercury* was he.

Of him we heare it now daylie noised by some that say, *Our Aduersary M. Parsons is dead* : which reporte may be beleueed but only in part; for although it be pos-

possible that *M. Parsons* be dead, yet will not our *Adversary* die, as long as his bookes, or cause shall liue in the handes and hartes of his fauorites. As for me, at the first hearing of these news I knew not wel whether rather to reioyce, that he was not suffered any longer to delude the simple; or grieue, that he was taken away before that he could see his owne errorrs, which are very foule, and in this *Encounter* fully discovered: I say no more, so farre am I from imitating his spirit, by insulting vpon the Ghosts of the dead.

Concerning your selfe (*most Noble, and renowned Prince*) it is the longing desire of all them, who are like piously affected, as were Gods people, when they prayed for the long life both of *Nabuchodnosor*, and also of *Baltasar his sonne*; that you would stand vpon two guardes, the one is *Confidence* in God, the other is wise and due *Prouidence* vnder God. For God, who was for many yeares so powerfull and glorious, in defending his truth in the weakenesse of a woman (*Q. Elizabeth*, the King of *Queens*) in time of extream hostility, against a most potent enemy, euen when hee boasted of his *Inuincible Nauie*, &c. made that godly and thrise noble *Deborah* to singe of the vast *Ocean* after the olde tune of the Riuer *Kisbon*, to wit, *The Riuer Kisbon* *Ind. 5. 21.*
swept them away, euen the ancient Riuer, the Riuer Kisbon:
 the same God can preferue you from the practises of
 The malignant, for the Lord of Hosts is his name.

Notwithstanding know likewise (*worthy and mighty Prince*) concerning *Prouidence* vnder God; that it was the voice of the *Tempter* who said, *He shall giue his Angels charge ouer thee, to keepe thee*, leauing out the *Luc. 4. 10.*
 next wordes, *In omnibus vijs tuis; in all thy wayes;* by
 which

perce X



To the High and Mightie Prince,
HENRY *Prince of Wales, Duke of*
Cornwall and Rothsay, Earle of Che-
ster, Knight of the most noble Order
of the GARTER, &c.



Did thinke it a matter
not altogether vnseason-
able, (*most Mighty*
Prince) if presently af-
ter the solemnization
of your Princely *Crea-*
tion with military spe-
ctacles (wherein innu-
merable beholders did,
in your reioycing, con-
gratulate both the happy comfort of your Royall Fa-
ther, our Gracious Soueraigne, and the hopefull ioy
of this whole land) I likewise should present vnto you
a kinde of military *Encounter*; which is, although lesse
solemne, yet more serious, because it oppugneth an
Aduersary vnto your Highnesse, not in a counterfait
shew and semblance, but in deede and reall practise:

^c M. Brekeley,
and his fellow
in their booke
called, *The Pro-*
testants Apology,
&c. the second
Edition Præfa.
to the Reader.
pag. 10.
^a Quodlib.
pag. 236.
^e Reck pag. 669

^f Cum unum id-
tum exemplum
tue defensionis
(he speaketh
vnto Gretzer)
in Frisiam allat-
um esset, bo-
cium propter me-
fandam male-
dicentiam non
inueniret empla-
rem. Lubber-
tus Replie.
lib. 1. cap. 1.

his owne diuers kindes of defaults. As first, to inueigh against me, as a passionate and intemperate man, whome his owne Apologists haue held to be a man not intemperate: and for him to giue that censure, whome his owne ^a fellow noted to be a man of a very violent and vnquiet spirit; and who himselfe, confesseth as it were his own intemperacy, by wisbing that in his Mitigation he ^c had not vsed such asperity of speeches against me. This sheweth that he had some cause to betake himselfe to a more sober and quiet Reckoning: wherem, notwithstanding, he dealeth so violently with me, (as my Reader will easily perceiue) that he often falsifieth the Title of his booke, not only by heaping vp more grieuous Acerbities; then formerly he had done, but also by setting against me Gretzerus to plow vpon my backe, who is a stranger and a Iesuit, and so profuse and professed

a railer, that whereas but one of his bookes was to be sould in West-Friesland, no man would buy it, because of the horrible slanders and railings which are therein. In all which kinde of raging tempests, I haue learned to cast this Anchor; Non qui patitur, sed qui facit iniuriam, miser est: And so I leaue this default of M. Parsons to receiue that name, which our Reader shall thinke to be most properly agreeable therunto.

In further examining of him bee bewrayed an *anadioria*, both by absurdities in Syllogizing; as concluding of Arc, in steade of Make; and being earnestly charged therewith, hath not yeilded so much as one of his bare-faced groates for discharge; And also by certaine Grammatical quiddities, whilest as he maketh Verè, being ioyned with Celsus (as it signifieth a proper name) to be no true Latine; and the translating of Præsidium, Præseruation; and not Defence, to be false English; and diuers other the like crotchets hath be inforced in this his new Reckoning.

Thirdly, there appeared a far greater fault, euen that *adulatio* whereby he chargeth me with no lesse then fifty wilfull falsehoods; as though he had learned of the Steward in the Gospell to ^e Sit downe and write fittie, whom for that cause his Lord termed wise; but yet vniust, vniust to his Master, and wise for himselfe. Such vniust wisdoms haue I found to abound in M. Parsons,

^e Luc. 16. v. 6.

To the Reader.

Parsons, who both in his booke of Mitigation, and in his new Reckoning obiecteth wilfull falshoods so unconscionably, that he himselfe (as is proued in this ^h Encounter) is intangled in farre more then fiftie witting (except some had rather I should say wullesse) yntruths.

^h The margi-
nall notes will
point almost at
euery one.

Of this kinde of dealing I haue more cause to complaine, perhaps, then some others, because I finde strange measures offered vnto me by my Aduersaries. For M. Parsons his bent to traduce me hath bene such, as sometime to condemne me for omitting wordes, which were by me expressly set downe; being in one place so violently transported with passions, as to lay to my charge the word Fortaile, for not translating it, perhaps, although in the very same place I translated and englished it twise, Peraduenture; which he could not but see, because once in the same place he repeated it accordingly: But it seemeth that in lenelling at me, as at his marke, he was onely left-eyed.

Also (which is a profound step of malignity) he diuers times obiecteth for wilfull falsities the Omissions of such clauses, which, if they had bene alleadged to the full, might haue made much more for the aduantage of my cause. This was no more honest dealing, then was that of the wife of Putiphar against Ioseph; He, for fear to be drawne by her pulling him by the cloake to her vncaste bedde, hastened away, and left his Cloake, a pledge and token of his chastitie: she, upon his flight, cryeth out, and complaineth that he came to abuse her, and for prooffe she saith, ⁱ Be- holde his garment; turning the same Cloake contrariely into an argument of his villany, and a Cloake of her owne dishonesty.

ⁱ Gen. 19.
^k The Romish
Apologists in
their second E-
dition of their
Protestants A-
pology, con-
cerning the te-
stimony of
Delir^o And
their Mode-
rate Answerer
in his late pa-
terne of a Pro-
testant, about
the legitimati-
on of Q. Mary
and Q. Eliz-
beth.
ⁱ Iud. 16. 20.

Again, whereas upon the finding out of mine owne Escapes, I gaue my Reader Aduertisements thereof in the end of my booke, and added Corrections thereunto; there my ^k Aduersaries (yet I cannot accuse M. Parsons of this guilt) being directed to my error by mine owne Aduertisement, doe forthwith upbraid mee with it, neuer giuing any notice that it hath bene corrected. So dealt the enemies of Sampson, who first plowed with his owne Heifer, then (which is spoken of the same men) ^j The Philistines are vpon thee Sampson. I pray God that they fall not vpon the imprecation, which was extended vnto the enemies of Dauid, who not regarding his repentance for his fault, and the amendment

A

of

To the Reader.

of his life, did point onely at his escape, saying, So, so would we haue it.

But yet *M. Parsons* is in another point no lesse inexcusable, whilst (which is his common guise) when foure or fixe, and sometimes nine testimonies of his owne *Authours* are obiected against him, for matter of a point in Controuersie, he singlet out some one allegation, wherein he laboureth by art to make at least some shew and colour of misprision, and then dismisseth all the other witnesses as dumbe men, and passeth over the whole cause it selfe without mention at all; and so diuers times *Altercando res non dirimuntur, sed perimuntur*. Can this be a tollerable manner of proceeding in the disquisition of any truth? This is not all, but (especially of late times) when our *Aduersaries* are muzzelled, as it were with the confessions of their owne *Doctors*, obiected for the iustification of our cause, they (as the *Egyptian Dogges* are said to lappe here and there of the riuer *Nilus*, and runne their way) doe catch and snatch onely at peeces, and carpe at some allegations, crying out (although neuer so falsely) against *Falshood*, and then beholde *The Booke*, forsooth, is answered. In all these proceedings they are, I confesse, in their generation, wise, but still vniust *Aduersaries*: And all vniust wisdom (we know) is before *God* iust nothing else, but miserable and damnable folly.

Fourthly and lastly, by much wrastring we haue discovered two other euils, the one is an *Hernia*, euen the disposition of disloyaltie in very extraordinary maner brusting out, and betraying diuers-where euident *Symptomes* thereof: And the other is his *Mentall Equiuocation*, which we may call *Alopecia*; the rather because *M. Parsons* himselfe doth take an argument, for iustification of it, from the *Foxe*, which, by instinct of nature, can turne and skip forward and backward, to secure himselfe. Vpon which occasion I haue in one place intreated my Reader to accompany me in the Hunting of this *Foxe*.

Howbeit, thou maiest not imagine (good Reader) that this whole Encounter is spent in vying and reuying of imputed falshoods, or in our wrastring together, and laying one the other in the dust: but here are inserted many other points of better consequence; as first, An answer to their challenge, for prouing some *Romanists* to be falsificators, which is performed by
ex-

To the Reader.

examples in their chiefeſt Writers, by the confeſſions and complaints of their owne men; together with an acknowledgment of their art in corrupting of bookes. Secondly, an anſwere to the ſlanders which Cardinall Bellarmine faſteneth upon Proteſtants, by imputing ſundry Heresies vnto them. Thirdly, an anſwere to a Challenge made by Mr. Parſons, concerning the Romiſh abuſes of the teſtimonies of Fathers, for prooſe of Purgatory, and that by the confeſſion of their owne Writers; which is amply diſcharged, both againſt the allegations of Bellarmine, and of Iodocus Coccius. Fourthly, an anſwere to a late Pamphlet, intituled A patterne of a Proteſtant; wherein the Authour maketh himſelfe the Patterne of an arrogant, ignorant, intemperate, and vnconſcionable man. Fifthly, there are diuers large Tracts, in conſutation of Mentall Equiuocation; eſpecially in the anſwere to his Appendix, wherein there is diſplayed the egregious forgery of an Equiuocation, in that memorable Yorkeſhire caſe; together with a freeing of the holy Scriptures, the Oracles of truth, from that prophana-tion, which he draweth vpon them, by pretending that they patronize this blacke art. Sixtly, and laſtly (to omit many other important coincidents) their doctrine of Rebellion is handled; In conſutation whereof (ſir this was the cauſe of all their malignancy againſt me) I was contented to be condemned for a moſt falſe accuſer of them, vpon condition that they by the e-uents would not iuſtifie their former Assertions. But alas, ſtill they ſet their Practizes as ſeales to their Poſitions.

Yet as when Bees beginne to caſt, men uſe to throw vp duſt in the aire, to hinder their ſight, leaſt they ſhould ſue from their homes, and ſet in ſome other place, ſo deale our Aduerſaries; for whenſeuer by any notorious praſtiſe they become ſo obnoxious, as to cauſe their people to ſuſpect their doctrine, and to incline to our Profeſſion: then for ſtaying of their departure, they in policy caſt abroad in the ayre ſome forged Reports of ſome ſtrange Miracles wrought in the honour of their cauſe; thus the ſame of Garnets Straw was diuulged, to allay the ſmoak of the Powder-treaſon; and late the noiſe of Diuels (as it is ſaid) carrying Engliſh Miniſters away in a Coach, hath been raiſed to hinder the laſt ſtrill ſound of that Royall blood.

To the Reader.

I returne to my Encounter against Mr. Parsons his Reckoning, so let thee vnderstand (good Reader) that I haue vsed him more calmly then, (I will not say) my cause (for, alas who am I, that I may not be iniuried?) but peradventure, then thou wilt thinke the Cause it selfe would permit: And especially in the very entrance into the Answer vnto his Appendix (when first I heard of any certainty of his death) the point of my Style did begin in a manner, so die with him; for so I thought it my duety, least I might seeme [Cæco scandalum] to deale too personally against him, who could not answer for himselfe.

an Aug.

Secondly, so my owne selfe I say, Non est intuentum quàm amarum, sed quàm falsum quod audio, & quàm verax pro cuius nomine audio.

Galat. 6. 17.

Thirdly, so my Adversaries I say, that by their practises in carping at allegations, whilst they sought to put out the candles, they haue but topped them, and made them shine more clearly; as may evidently appeare by this Encounter. Notwithstanding, whosoever shall intend to Reply vnto this, or any other booke of mine, let him (if he expect to be answered) not carpe at peeces, but proceede soberly and orderly from point to point in the cause; otherwise I must say with the Apostle, Let none put mee from henceforth vnto businesse.

o Hier. l. 3. Proëm in Epist.

Finally to thee (Christian Reader, if thou thinke thy selfe a Scholler) I say with S. Ierom; Figas ipse stylum; tria, (vt dicitur) verba cōiungas; sudes paululum, experiare temetipsū, & ex labore proprio discas ignoscere laborātib⁹. And althogh thou be of another cōditio, yet fir my iustificatiō against M. Parsons (who called me a Falsificator) I say as S. Aug. did in answer to Petiliā; He saith (saith S. Aug.) that I am a Manichee, speaking of my cōsciēce, & I say I am not so, speaking of mine own cōsciēce, & now choose whō thou wilt beleue. Or els (because the matter is put vnto thy proof) I rather say with S. Paul; Try al things, & keep that which is good: Try this booke, and my faithfulness by it, wherein (least any may be suspected for my defects) I professe to alleage no testimony, that is noted in the margent, which I haue not perused & examined with mine own eyes. Thus I end, beseeching our Lord Iesus to illuminate thee with the spirit of Truth, and to preserve vs to the glory of his sauing Grace.

r Me Petilianus Manichæū esse dicit, loquens de me Conscientia, hoc ego iudico me non esse, loquens de meā Conscientiā: eligite cui credatis. 1. Thess. 5. 21.

Thine in Christ,
Th. Morton.

THE PRINCIPALL CONTENTS OF THIS ENCOV'NTER.

In the first Booke.

C A P. 1.

THe confessed *Falsifications* of their I-
suite *Suarez*, §. 2. and *Belarmine*, §. 3
The errors of *Barani*, *ibid*. Vntruths
of *Boucher*, §. 4. Foule corruptions of *Grati-*
an, §. 5. and vniust dealing of *Maft*, *Parsons*
himselfe, §. 7.

C A P. 2.

An examination of the sleeping *Souldi-*
ers speech, [*His Disciples came and stole him*
away]. by a fourfold conuiction, §. 1. An ex-
amination of *M. Parsons* his *Syllogisme*; no-
ting his pittifull pouerty in *Logique*, and
his fraudes therabout, §. 2.

C A P. 3.

The *Impossibility* of their due subiection,
proued by foure Arguments. His dissem-
blances and frauds therabout. In the end
hee betrayeth himselfe, §. 1. to §. 5. And
lastly, of the *Exemption of Priests*, §. 5.

C A P. 4.

The *bunting of the Foxe*, by winding out
the suble trickes of *M. Parsons* his *Mentall*
Equiuocation: about the speech of the wo-
man *Saphyra*; shewing thereupon his vn-
iust dealings; his pittifull plunges; and
lastly the desperatenesse of all his defence

C A P. 5.

Of *Falsities* objected vnto some Roma-
nists, especially in *Popes*, about the feyned
Canon of Nice, fully handled. *P. R.* his per-
uerse dealing.

C A P. 6.

The credite of *Gratian* impeached by
their owne Bishop, *Mr. Parsons* his triple
falshood.

C A P. 7.

The *Contradictions* of Romanists, confu-

ting one another about the Councell of *Ge-*
liberis, in the point of *Images*, §. 1. Therein
Surius his slanderous falshood. Their *Con-*
tradictions about the Councell of *Francford*
concerning *Images*. *Mr. Parsons* his wilfull
falshood, §. 2. Their *Contradictions* about the
Epistle of *Epiphanius*, concerning *Images*,
and *M. Parsons* his vniust calumny, §. 3.

C A P. 8.

*Card. Bellarmine*s manifold *Slaunders* a-
gainst Protestants, as first obiecting the he-
resie of the *Pelagians* about *Originall* and
Veniall finnes, §. 1. Of the *Novatians* in deny-
ing *Penance*: *Mr. Parsons* his fraudulent dis-
semblance, precipitate rashnesse, fond and
false reprehension therabout §. 2. And of
the *Manichees* in the question of *Freewill*. *M.*
Parsons abuseth the testimony of *S. August.*
and *S. Ierome* in this point. His heady taxa-
tion, §. 3. Of *Arianisme* against *Bullinger*. *M.*
Parsons maketh *Belarm.* to betray the Ca-
tholike cause, §. 4. Another heresie concern-
ing the *Soules* going, but not immediately
to *heauen*. *M. Parsons* his ignorance of *Bel-*
*larmine*s meaning, with whom he said he did
consult, §. 5. The heresie of an [*Onely figure*]
in the Sacrament of the *Eucharist*. *M. Par-*
sons his vnreasonable taxation §. 6

C A P. 9.

Card Bellarmine his corrupt *Allegations*, §
1. *Rome* by iust consequence not the *Mo-*
ther Church. *Mr. Parsons* his ignorance, his
dissembling, his odde *Cauiil*, his deceitful-
nesse, his strange lust to accuse his *Aduer-*
sary, §. 2. The Authority of *Platina*. *M. Par-*
sons his Answer, betraying thereby the au-
thority of all late Romish Writers, §. 3.

C A P. 10.

Bellarmino his false allegation of *Fathers*,
A 3 for

THE CONTENTS.

for proove of *Purgatory* *M. Parsons* his dexterity in fraudulent dealing. His other three *Falshoods*.

CAP. II.

M. Parsons his *Challenge* against *T. M.* exacting of him: an examination of the sixty *Fathers* (alleged by *Coccius*, for defence of *Purgatory*:) to proove that thirty one of them are eyther *Apocrypha*, or *corrupt*, or *wrested*. The state of the whole Controversie, set downe and prosecuted at large: And the notable and manifold abuses of *Coccius* reuealed.

CAP. 12.

The *Falshoods*, wherewith *M. Parsons* was charged in the *preamble*, and his fond and false accounts he maketh. His fourefold falshood committed against *Caluine*: one whereof is most perfidious, §. 1. About the *latine Clause* of *Reseruation*. His notable fraude in answering, containing a brace of vntruths, §. 2. Of the [*Chaire* of *vnlearned Doctors*.] *M. Parsons* his two falshoods in one §. 3. His grosse falshood about *Goodman*, §. 4. His double vntruth about *Knox* and *Bucchanan*: and an other new falshood besides §. 5. About the question of *auvtdnes*. *Mr. Parsons* his confessed error, but yet miserable excuse. His faithlesse dealing against *Caluine*, §. 6. His many falshoods in one §. 7. Touching a *Transition*. His excellent art in *confessing* a falshood so, as not *confessing* it; and the palpability therof §. 8. Concerning the testimony of *Holinshed* about *Viat. M. Parsons* concealing his falshood. His other poore shift §. 9. About the Text of *Esa.* 29. His threefold falsity, §. 10. The Citation of *Caverius*, whereunto answering, he learnedly bewrayeth want of learning in a Grammaticall quiddity, §. 11. *Dolmans* testimony. *M. Parsons* his crafty concalement. His disloyalty. His deaying his owne writing, §. 12. The testimony of *Frisingenis*, concerning Pope *Greg.* 7. alias *Hildebrand*. *M. Parsons*, a plaine falsifier. His childish excuse. His ab-

surd Reasoning. His treasonable doctrine. His negligence in Story, §. 13. The testimony of *Especaus*, concerning *Hildebrand*. *M. Parsons* his palpable vntruth, §. 14.

CAP. 13.

M. Parsons charged with falsities; about the question of *Mentall Equiuocation*. His lost logicke, §. 1. *Scpn'ueda* his iudgement, touching mentall Equiuocation. *M. Parsons* his euident vntruths, §. 2. *Azorius* his iudgement concerning Mentall Equiuocation. The State of the question. *M. Parsons* his manner of Equiuocating found to belying His forgery to remooue a rubbe and note of a lie. His strong and strange delusion. He professeth to Equiuocate wuth his friends, §. 3. The opinion of *Eman. Sa* about Mentall Reseruation. The ob. of leauing out of the word *perhaps*, in translating [*Fortè potiori ratione*,] being before his eyes repeated: Herein a desperate falsification. Another as vile a falsity. No certainty, what the opinions of late Romanists are, because of their altering and corrupting of their books, §. 4. Obseru the like out of the §. 5. and cap. 1. §. 6 and ca. 14. §. 1. *Maldonate* his opinion about Mentall Reseruation. *M. Parsons* his dissolute ignorance. His friuolous distinction [of *principal* and *not principal* intention to deceive] §. 5.

CAP. 14.

An answer vnto *M. Parsons* his obiected vntruths, which he hath (out of the *preamb.*) called into a new *Reckoning*. First, concerning *Polydore*. *M. Parsons* his notable fraud. Popes charge their Christian names, §. 1. The Pope choaked with a flie. *M. Parsons* his fond cauillations: And fraudulent concalement. The disastrous endes of other Popes. *M. Parsons* his crafty falshood, about Pope *Anastasijs* death, §. 2. *Bouchers* testimony of killing a Tyrant. *M. Parsons* his notorious falshood. Another inexcusable falshood, §. 3. The testimony of *Raynolds* obiected and answered. *Mr. Parsons* his scurrill sport

THE CONTENTS.

sport vpon a word. His deceit. That the power of a King is immediately from God. §. 4. The testimony of Gratian objected M Parsons confuted by their owne Cardinal. §. 5. The Glosse objected, and answered The doctrine of killing of Kings. Mr. Parsons by silence, betrayeth his disloyalty. §. 6. Glosse of the Extravagants objected and answered. His frothy Argument, Jugling; fraude. A bloody Glosse, §. 7. Bellarmine concerning the judgement of Caluine, about *autobbe* §. 8. M. Parsons his vnwise demaund, §. 8. The text of Esa. 29. [Thou art blinde, &c.] objected and answered. §. 9. Carverius his [Verē or Verū] ob. and answered. M. Parsons in a manner confessing his former slander. His fraude §. 10. Dolman his [Damnable Sinner] ob. and answered, §. 11. Censure of [All Priests, &c.] ob. and answered, §. 12. Otto Frisingensis about Pope Greg. 7. ob. and answered. What manner of grauel M. Parsons casts. §. 13. Foxe and Holinshead ob. and answered M. Parsons his falsity His figment. His lustfull appetite to wrangle. A memorable example of treacherous Bishoppes; from the exclamation of Rodulph, §. 14.

In the second Booke.

CAP. 1.

First answering M. Parsons his olde objections of Falshoods out of his Mitigation. He beginneth with a lauiſh falsity. §. 1. Pasquez objected and answered, §. 2. Azorinus ob. and answered. M. Parsons his inordinate iangling about wordes, §. 3. And extreame captiuouſnesse, §. 4. Tolet ob. and answered. M. Parsons his folly, §. 6. Barclay and Bellarmine about the power of [Gathering Synods] ob. and answered. M. Parsons his profuse fraude. And grosse falshood. And manifold absurdities, §. 7. Salmeron (about the ſoueraignty of the King ouer Priests in the olde Testament) ob. and answered. M. Parsons his notable falshood. Hce is flatly confuted by Salmeron, §. 8.

CAP. 2.

Carerius (about the same point) ob. and answered. M. Parsons his egregious vntruth, §. 1. Dolman objected and answered. M. Parsons his childish exceptions. And ignorance of his owne booke, §. 2. Once againe Carerius ob. and answered. M. Parsons his open falshood, §. 3. Victoria ob. and answered. M. Parsons his grosse slander, §. 4. The Canon of Gratian [Si Papa] ob. and answered. Mr. Parsons his many idle impertinencies. His great ignorance, §. 5. His Obiect against

Sir Fr. Hastings [about Dominum Deum Papam] answered. M. Parsons his blinde infolency, or perfidious hypocrisie, §. 6. Pope Leo ob. concerning the Oath of Allegiance, and answered. M. Parsons his cholericke answer therin; his promise exacted. His ignorance in constructions, §. 7. Sepulveda touching Equiuocation. M. Parsons his wilfull falshood, §. 8.

CAP. 3.

The opinion of Sotus, concerning Mental Equiuocation, falsly and grossely abused by M. Parsons. The question there discussed by examples, §. 1. Cunnus ob. and answered. M. Parsons his meere cauil, §. 2. Cassander ob. and answered. M. Parsons his idle, and fond collusion His faithlesse dealing. The name of Papist odious, and yet glorious among the Romanists, §. 3. Reynard ob. and answered. M. Parsons his excellent falshood: And after that another notorious falsity, §. 4. Againe, Cunnus ob. and answered. M. Parsons vnconſcionably iniurious. *ibid.* Sayr ob. and answered. M. Parsons snatcheth at wordes, and pretermitteth materials, §. 5.

CAP. 4.

Cicero objected in the point of Mental Equiuocation. M. Parsons a warie gamster. His misconstruction of Tully. His excellent

pepee

THE CONTENTS.

piece of craft. He preiudiceth his conscience, § 1. *Barclay* and *Boucher* ob. and answered *M. Parsons* fine trickes of fraude. His malicious falshood, § 2. Again, *Barclay* ob. and answered. *M. Parsons* his shamelesse fraude, § 3.

CAP. 5.

Heapes of vntruthes obiected, and answered, concerning [*Popes being Heretickes, as Popes, and therefore Deposed.*] *M. Parsons* his marueylous perversnes in reporting the iudgement of his Authors, § 1. His notable guile, and falshood. His cunning. A Romish mysterie, § 2.

CAP. 6.

Conteyning a brife *Censure* of a Pamphlet, intituled [*The patterne of a Protestant*] who hath made himselſe a patterne of singular *Arrogancy, vntruth, ignorance and malice.* Adde heereunto his slaundersous vntruths, when he plaid the *Moderate Answerer*, cap 7. § 7.

CAP. 7.

M. Parsons obiecteth the omitting of the defence of some Protestants; as of *Caluine* about *Arianisme*; which is answered. (the obseruable testimonies which some Romanists giue of *Caluine*) § 1. And of my *L. Cooke* § 1. and § 6. *Omissions* of *M. Parsons* in not defending his *Clients*: Answer to manifolde Slanders, § 3. His not defending the *Popes* Clergy-men subiect to Emperours. *Constantines* Donation, § 4. His neglecting the defence of the *Moderate Answerer* in his notorious Slanders, § 5. An answer to his ob. of *fresh lies*. Therin his excellent fraude § 7.

CAP. 8.

His obiected *Vaunts* answered. His *Strangers Censure* against *T. M.* required. His *lesuite Gretters* censure iustly contemned, § 1. The *Challenges* made against *M. Parsons* a-uouched, and performed, § 2.

CAP. 9.

M. Parsons his *Appendix* confuted. His most memorable *Yorkshire-Case* for *Equiuocating* finely, maliciously, and impudently forged: As is manifestly prooued by many vncontrollable conuictions, § 1. His fier edge against *Doctor King* abated, by examples of Iesuiticall Equiuocators, § 2.

CAP. 10.

A confutation of *Maſt. Parsons* his defence of *Mentall Reseruation*, from the speeches of *Christ*, recorded in the 8. cap. of *Saint Iohn*, and first distinguishing betwene *Verball* and *Mentall* Equiuocation, § 1. That in Generall the Scripture alloweth not Romish Reseruation, § 2. The eight speeches of *Christ* taken out of the cap 8. *Iob* obiected, and satisfied, § 3. Scriptures which *M. Parsons* ob. in his *Mitigation*, answered; as *Iob. 1. 21. matth. 9. 10. Ioh. 6. Eſa. 37.* § 4. An olde ob. in the *Mitigation* out of *Iob. 7. 8.* [*I will not goe vpyes,*] answered. *M. Parsons* his grosse ignorance touching the state of the question, § 5.

CAP. 11.

Against *mentall Equiuocation*, prouing it to be a lie; by the confessions of their owne Doctors; by examples from *Fathers, Heretickes* and *Pagans*, § 1. Euidences of the impiety of it, by *Cases*, § 2. and by *Effects*, *ibid.* His foule vntruth. *ibid.*



THE
ENCOVNTER
AGAINST Mr.
PARSONS.

The first Booke.

CHAP. I.

An Introduction to the Reueiw.

SECT. I.

1.



His *Encounter* consisteth of these two parts, the first is a *Reuew* of Master *Parsons* his last *Reckoning*; the second of such points as concerne his *Treatise of Mitigation*: and the issue of them both will be (God willing) the reasonable performance of my former Challenge.

2. And because the first part (which is his *Reckoning*) is
B spent

spent especially about the charge and discharge of *Falsifications*, which haue beene reciprocally objected on both sides, concerning matters of maine Consequence; I thought it requisite to Encounter him first in these: and in this *Introduction* and Entrance to repell his maine assault, who hath made *falsifying* to be a *substantiall distinctiue* note of discerning betwene *Protestants*, and his *Catholicke* writers; and by some particular Instances to take away the fiery edge of his former presumption, after that we haue seene that which followeth.

*Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning in the behalfe of
all Romish Writers.*

*Reckoning. ca. 3.
§. 1. pa. 119. 120.*

*P. & his pre-
sumption.*

BEcause this is a matter of great importance, I mean to stay my self vpon this point, and to shew that it is indeede a substantiall signe distinctiue betwene all Sectaries and vs at this time; and that in matters of Controuersie, our Writers shall neuer be found guiltie of these kinds of false, lying, and malicious Equiuocations, where not only vntruth is vttered, but it is willingly also vttered, the Writer knowing that he writeth an vntruth: which manner of dealing, argueth two points, the one, that such a writer hath no conscience, that vttereth that which God seeth to be false, and falsly meant in his heart; and the other, that his cause hath no ground of substantiall truth, which cannot be defended without such wilfull lies. In this then, if it please you, insist a while, and let Mr. *Morton* bring forth in Print, any Catholicke Author that wrote against Protestants, since these heresies began, that hath beene taken in this impietie: I meane, that hath set downe in Print any such falsitie as cannot be excused either by ignorance, ouersight, negligence, error of Print, translation, diuersitie of Editions, or the like: but that it must needs be presumed that he knew the vntruth, and yet would set it forth; of this kind, I say, let him shew me but one example among all Catholicke Writers of our time, and I will in my Conscience greatly mistrust and discredite that Author, whether it be an other, or my selfe: but if he shew me two or three in any Writer in this kind, I shall be hardly able euer after to beleue him more. And whereas the number and varietie of Catholicke Writers is so great, as the world seeth, it were no great labour to shew it in some, if that spirit doth raigne among them, as it doth among Protestant Writers.

SECT.

S E C T. II.

The Reuiew; yeelding diuers examples of Romish Falsificators, euen by the iudgement of their owne Writers; faithfully related. The first partie accused is their Iesuit Fr: SUAREZ.

3. **M**After *Parsons* will not esteeme any Writers to deserue better the name of *Catholike Writers*, then the *Iesuites*: who are, as it were, the naturall brethren of his own Order; nor can he account any *Iesuite* a more worthie Writer then is their Iesuite *Suarez*, publike Reader in the Vniuersitie of *Salamanca*, whom their Iesuite ^a *Possennine* hath Registered among the most famous Authors of these times; nor may he iudge any Writing of *Suarez*, more obseruable then are those his ^b workes, which haue bene approoued by a whole Vniuersitie.

^a *Possennine Apparatus. Tit. Fr. Suarez.*

^b *Varia Opuscula Theologica*, approved by the Vniuersitie of *omplutum*, vnder the hands of eight Doctors See the beginning.

4. This Iesuite *Suarez* commeth now to be conuicted for a Falsificator, but not by Protestants: because Mr. *Parsons* hath a Licence and Facultie to call their accusations *Lies* and *Falshoods*, although they be neuer so iust: therefore must we seeke out of the Romish Schoole, some one approoued witnesse, who hath made a priuie search into the writings of the foresaid Iesuite; and hath also discovered some of his wilfull transgressions in alleadging of Authors.

The Accuser is Fr: CUMEL.

5. Our witnesse shall be ^c *Fr. Cumel*, Professor also of *Diuinitie* in the Vniuersitie of *Salamanca*; ^d commended by *Diego Nuncio*, and *Antonius Soto-Mayor* for one, in whose Memorie *7 he Church* (say they) *which is the Spouse of Christ*, may congratulate her owne good, in that she had so singular, and euery way so absolute a Teacher, who in these his last workes hath excelled not onely other ancient and moderne writers, but also himselfe: vnto whose commendation *Rob. Bertelot*, and *A. Priquen* doe subscribe: Him hath also *Ant. Hereros*, Publike pro-

^c *Franciscus Cumel, variarum disputationum. Erc. Lugduni. 1609.*

^d See all these *Encomia*, in the beginning of his worke.

fessor in the Vniversitie of Pintia, greatly extolled in his commendatorie Epistle, calling this *Cumel* the very heart of the Vniversitie wherein he was Professor, whose name was honored (saith he) by Pope Clement the eight. And yet againe is this Doctor further magnified in the Epistle Dedicatory by Fr. Ildesonsus, who reporteth *Cumel* to haue beene an admirable man, both for learning and wisedome, In somuch that Kings did consult with him in their most weightie affaires, and that Schollers, when they desired to haue the most hard Questions assoyled, resorted vnto him, as vnto the Oracle of Apollo.

6. Let vs now heare what this so honourable a witnesse and Oracle will say, concerning the dealing of the former *Iesuite*, in a matter of high moment, such as is the power of Gods effectuall Grace in acting mans will vnto good: from the efficacie of which Grace of God, the same *Iesuite* (in the opinion of *Cumel*) did somewhat detract, for the vniust aduancement of the power of mans will. It will be my part not to examine or discusse: but onely to report the saying of *Cumel*, which I will do as faithfully, as if the whole cause depended hereupon.

The Accusation it selfe.

• F. *Cumel* Dispu.
Variar. Tom. 3.
pag. 126. col. 1.
† Pag. 128. col. 2.
‡ Pag. 129. col. 1.

Papists accusing their Brethren of egregious falsifications.

⁂ Ibid. pag. 267. col. 2.
⁃ Pag. 15. col. 1. in margine.
⁄ Ibid. pag. 137. col. 2. in margine.
⁅ Ibid. pag. 133. col. 1.

7. • Saint Hieroms testimonie (saith *Cumel*) *Dolosè citatur ab Aduersarijs* (speaking of *Molina*, *Suarez*, and some other Romish writers) that is, *Is fraudulently cited*: And, † *Ca-preolus is cited craftily by them*: ⁂ *I am grieved to see how fraudulently they cite Driedo, vrging that which he spake, by way of argumentation, or obiection, for his owne iudgement, whereas Driedo vseth many Arguments to disprooue that opinion.* But we shall be contented to dismisse *Molina* and those others, let *Cumel* and *Suarez* meete vpon the Stage alone, and so shall we be better able to discerne the disposition of the partie accused.

8. ⁂ *Suarez* (saith *Cumel*) doth not intirely, and faithfully, relate the sentence of *Molina*: And † expoundeth *Molina*, but in a sense contrary to his meaning: ⁂ *Suarez* citeth the sentence of *Soto*, leaping ouer a part of it, and suppressing those words which made against him. † *I doe obserue* (saith *Cumel*) that *Suarez* alladged

alleadged Driedo, whose sentence and wordes make plainly against him, as I have shewed; so that I cannot tell with what spirit he is cited of Suarez: and much lesse doe I perceine to what end Stapleton is alleadged, whose words doe more expressly make against them. ^m Suarez hath taken out of the testimonie of Saint Thomas the word, Præordination, and put instead of it, Subordination, and expoundeth S. Thomas sinisterly. ⁿ Suarez produceth for his prooffe the testimonie of Chrysostome, [Ad Heb. hom. 12. super cap. 7. vbi ait, Nostras non antecedit voluntates; nè liberum lædatur arbitrium,] cutting of that which went immediately before, and that also which immediatly followed: because he perceived that the sense and opinion of Chrysostome did not favour his opinion at all. ^o Suarez vrgeth Pope Clement in his third Epistle, saying that he hath these words; [Si aliquid esset, quod audientes fidem vel ad credendum, vel ad non credendum determinaret extra arbitrium eorum, meritum & libertatem tolli.] Which words he hath printed in new and distinct Characters and Letters, as though they were the very words of Pope Clement, when as indeed that most holy Pope neuer deliuered those words, neither are they in that Epistle.

^m Ibid. pag. 195.
col. 1.

ⁿ Ibid. pag. 124.
col. 2.

^o Ibid. pag. 131.
col. 2.

9. And thus doth Cumel proceed against Suarez, in censuring his falsifications in these and other allegations, wherein Cumel seemeth to discern nothing but wilfull frauds in that their Iesuite Suarez; whom notwithstanding they magnifie for one, ^r Who, by the iudgement of all the most learned men, (as they say) seemeth to haue abundantly satisfied Hereticks (so they call Protestants) and Catholickes, in the doctrine of the Sacraments in the new Law.

^r Epist. Dedicat.
in Tom. 3.

10. Seeing now (good Reader) that Fr. Suarez, one of their chiefe order (which is the order of Iesuits,) and the choicest writer which is now living in that Societie, in a fewe Chapters of but one so primarily an authorized Booke, concerning one onely Controuersie, hath committed so many falsities, which their owne so much approoued Doctor Cumel cannot free from wilfull fraudes and corruptions; what multitudes of falshoodes shall we thinke may be found in all the huge
B 3 and.

and vast Volumes, which he and other Iesuits haue published, concerning all other questions of Controuerſie, if that any ingenuous *Cumel* might be permitted to ransack all their Allegations?

II. Although this one so singular an *Instance*, being comprehended by such an Accuser in so many, and so notorious falsities, doth sufficiently encounter Mr. PARSONS his demaund, who offered to be contented but with *one example* of any one, who hath committed but *three* such inexcusable defaults: yet lest that Master PARSONS his modestly may giue him leaue, & his wit power to answer me according to the Greeke Prouerbe, *εις ἀνδρ' ἢ δ' εἰς ἀνδρ'*, which is, to turne an vnitie into a Cypher, and to make account that one onely example is as good as none at all; therefore haue I thought it further more requisite to single out *Duo magna lumina*, that is, the two great lights of that Church, Cardinall Bellarmine, and Cardinall *Baronius*, and to shew the wonderfull Eclipses and spots of falshood, which their owne Doctores haue discerned in these two.

The partie accused is Cardinall BELLARMINE,
In behalfe of whom Master PARSONS hath challenged me in this *Reckoning*, viz.

Reckon. cap. 3.
5.6 pag. 149. 150

IF you haue seene how little able Mr. Morton hath beene to performe his promise before, for wilfull falsities committed by any of our Writers hitherto; much more shall you see now, when leauing the multitude of other Authors, he singleth out Cardinall Bellarmine alone to deale withall: who as he hath written much, so were it not maruell if in so many Bookes, he should haue left some things, whereupon his Aduerſaries might probably wrangle. But as for wilfull vntruthes, it is so farre from his knowen and confessed integritie, as Mr. Morton could neuer haue made choice of an vnſitter match for this point. Nor can it be thought that he chose him, vpon hope to find any such aduantage in him indeed, but onely to honour himselfe, by contending with such an Aduerſarie, and to cast some clouds, at least in the minds of the simple sort, vpon the shining beames of Cardinall Bellarmines estimation, by obiecting the name of wilfull falsities vnto him. But as when the said clouds are driuen away from the ayre, the force of the Sunne is more sensibly felt: So Card. Bellarmines workes, being

being cleared here from Mr. Mortons calumniation, will be more highly esteemed by euery iudicious Reader, as not lending any least true aduantage vnto any impugnation of the Aduersary. And this is all the hurt that he is like to receiue by this Assault.

S E C T. III.

The Reuiewe.

12. I Shall desire Mr. Parsons to forbear a while the examination of the exceptions, which I haue taken against Cardinall *Bellarmino*, vntill we come to discusse that point; when it wil appeare how feeble a Boreas Mr. Parsons is in dispelling of clouds: and for the present to haue so much patience, as to vnderstand, what & how foggie a mist of insinceritie, some Authors of their owne profession haue spied in the writings of this their *Bellarmino*, whom Mr. Parsons preferreth for sinceritie before all others of his side.

His three Accusers.

13. The first Accuser is *Iob. Marfilus*, who beginneth his defence against *Bellarmino*, with prayer vnto God, and to the blessed Virgine; who mentioneth *Bellarmino*, with all reuerend respect, by the appellation of *Most illustrious Lord*; who is authorized in this his aunswere vnder the publicke approbation of the State of Venice. The second is *P. Paulus*, as select a Writer as *Marfilus*, and equally approoued. The third is *Guil. Barclaius*, who yeeldeth vnto *Bellarmino* this dignifying Title of *Most famous Cardinall, and most learned Diuine*, in that booke which he Dedicated to Pope *Clement 8.* The exceptions that they take against *Bellarmino*, are concerning one onely Controuersie of his: which is the defence of the Papall power, in censuring of Temporall States.

Their Accusations.

14. For his abuse of the testimonies of *Schoolemen* hee is thus

Defensio Iohannis Marfilij in fauorem Responso 8. propositiones continens, aduersus quod scripsit illustrissimus & reuerendissimus Cardinallis Bellarminus. Venetys 1606.
Apologia P. Pauli. Venetys An. 1606.
Barclaius de potestate Papae Ad Clementem 8. Pontif. cap 37.

^u *Marfilij defens.*
pag. 280.

^a Pag. 285.

Notable falsi-
fications of
Bellar. confes-
sed.

^b Pag. 297.

^c Pag. 322.

^d pag. 324.

^e Ibid.

^f Pag. 361.

^g P. Paulus Apo-
log. pag. 569.

^h Bellarminus
planè contra-
rium Gersoni
tribuit, &c.

^h *Marfil. defens.*
pag. 222.

thus noted. ^u He erreth (saith *Marfilius* speaking of *Bellar-
mine*) in expounding Thomas contrary to his meaning, whose
Catholick Doctrine, in all matters of Divinitie, I doe professe.
^a He erreth in saying that the Author (whom *Bellarmino* im-
pugneth) held that Christ was constrained by necessitie to pay
tribute, but the Author affirmeth the contrary, to wit, that Christ
as the Sonne of God, was not bound to pay tribute, yet did it for
avoyding of scandall. ^b He erreth in denying that Sotus did
marvell at the Canonist, (viz. For saying that the Pope is the
Lord of the whole world, directly in temporall things.) For
Sotus doth expressly name certaine Lawyers, or Canonists, and
callethe their opinion in this point commemittious, or fabulous,
complaining and marvelling that Syluester departed from the
iudgement of Thomas: yea and the same wordes of Sotus were
read in the first Bookes of the Lo. Cardinall himselfe (viz. *Bel-
larmino*) which if he will not acknowledge, it skilleth not, for we
finde in his (viz. *Bellarmines*) bookes fixe hundred alterations.
^c He erreth in saying that Nauarre writ, that [The Popes au-
thoritie was not meereley temporall,] as though he had confessed
the Popes authoritie to be temporall, and accessoryly spirituell;
but Nauarre neuer writ this, but held plainely the contrary. ^d Hee
saith indeed that the Papall power may vse naturall thinges,
which are instituted by Christ, for supernaturall ends, such as are
water in Baptisme, and money for Almes: but doth he ever speake
of Temporall power? he neuer so much as dreamed hereof. ^e But
it is no rare thing (as we haue seene) for his illustrious Lordship,
(meaning *Bellarmino*) to cite Authors for an opinion, whereas
they affirme the plaine contrary. ^f He erreth in saying absolute-
ly, that Sotus and Couarruias affirmed that which they spake
with condition, viz. Ordinariè. ^g He ^h abuseth the testimonie of
Gerson (saith the second Accuser) noting that to haue bene spo-
ken against the due reuerence vnto the Pope, whereas contrariely
he spake in fauour of the Pope.

15. Let vs passe ouer their Schoole, and come vnto the
testimonies of Fathers and Councils; wherunto the first Ac-
cuser (*Marfilius*) proceedeth, saying of *Bellarmino*, that
^h He erreth in affirming that Chrylostome (expounding that
place

place of Paul, *Rom. 13.* Let every soule be subiect unto the higher powers) speaketh of power in generall (as though hee did as well imply spirituall power, as temporall (according as *Bellarmino* himselfe doth interpret the text) whereas *S. Chrysostome* speaketh plainely of Princes and Magistrates. And because he (namely *Bellarmino*) bringeth no reason for his Answer, it will not be amisse to demonstrate his error by reasons: for that which the Apostle calleth [higher power] *Chrysostome* interpreteth to be Princes and Magistrates, who make politique lawes, and who sustaine the burthen of the Common-wealth, unto whom the Apostle commandeth men to pay tribute; and, which doth preoccupate all meanes of evasion, *Chrysostome* sheweth that obedience unto these powers is commanded unto Monkes or Priests, yea although he were eyther Apostle, Prophet, or Evangelist. ⁱ Hee erreth in cyting falsely the place of *S. Hierome*, who saith the plain contrary: ^k It grieveth me to see things imputed unto holy Fathers, the contrary whereof they affirme: ^l And hee offendeth also in cyting the place of *S. Augustine*. ^m Hee erreth in alleaging the Councell of Colen, for that Councell determined nothing thereof, but according to the Glosse, &c. Finally, ⁿ See, good Reader (saith their *P. Paulus*) the cunning of this Author (namely *Bellarmino*) saying that the fift Romane Councell under Pope *Symmachus*, did allow, as her owne Decree, that sentence of *Ennodius* [*Aliorum hominum causas, &c.*] whereas that sentence shall not be any where found to have beene specially approved, or so much as named in that Councell. And ^o Hee hath added of himselfe (speaking of a Decree of a Councell of Laterane, under Pope *Alexander* the third) these wordes, [*Quod nullus sit in terris Papa Superior,*] That is, Because there is none in earth Superiour unto the Pope.

16. Because a third witness is requisite, for the better establishment of any Accusation, we may admit the testimony of *Barclaius* in this cause: who albeit he commendeth *Bellarmino*, for his faithfulness, in respect of the dealings of others, yet ^p It cannot be denied (saith he) but that *Bellarmino*, by following *Sanders* and others rashly, hath not a little erred in three points of his defence of the Popes temporall authority: and therefore

ⁱ Pag. 288.

^k Pag. 289.

^l Ibid.

^m Pag. 346.

ⁿ P. Paulus A-pol. pag. 602.

^o Ib. pag. 606.

^p Barcla. de potesta. Pope 2. 37.

upon could not But *marvell* (as he himselfe saith) that men, who are for their learning so famous, doe so negligently set downe their iudgements in writing, as though they had not read the Authours which they commend, or had not vnderstood them at all, or else had purposefully adulterated their meaning: which fault is frequent in this age. And among other errors of *Bellarmino*, he

^a 1b. cap. 32.
^r Conc. Agathen.
Anno 506. can.
32.

he^r obserueth him to follow *Gratian* in a singular corruption, to wit; whereas an auncient^r Councell decreed *Can. 32.* [*Nē Clericus quemaquam præsumat apud secularem Iudicem, Episcopo non permittente, pulsare*] *Gratian* contrariwise deliuereth it thus: *Clericum nullus præsumat pulsare, &c.*

17. These few faults are more then enough, to haue beene discovered by their owne Authours, out of one Controuersie of their *Cardinall Bellarmine*. As for other notes of his contradictions, wherof he is conuinceable, I remit them vnto their proper place. In the interim seeing that *Card. Bellarmine* (who, in *Mr. Parsons* his estimate; is the most *Sincere* Author of all other Romanists) hath beene thus deeply charged by their owne Doctors of so much insincerity, our Reader may conceiue thereby how little confidence any may yeeld vnto their other lesse considerate or conscionable Doctors.

* See hereafter, cap. 8.

I proceede, and (because the fellowshippe which *Card. Bellarmine* had with *Card. Baronius*, will not permit them to be diuided) I adde

An Accusation made by the foresaid Marfilius, against their Cardinall BARONIUS.

18. *Cardinall Bellarmine* aduanceth *Cardinal Baronius* in this manner: ^a That most worthy and learned *Baronius* (saith he) doth demonstrate by most cleare euidences, that there was neuer such priuiledge granted vnto Emperours, for the electing of the Pope. ^b But I haue answered (saith *Marfilius*) that *Baronius* hath no authority in the Question of Immunities: I haue heard, that as he hath taken a liberty to mend the Fathers, Canons and Historians, so he will correct the Councels after his manner, and for his owne purpose; and to assume vnto himselfe

^a *Marfil. quosuprà*, pag. 357.

^b *Ibid.*

a license herunto, which God forbid! Certain it is, he shall not be able to mend the text of S. Paul, of Chrysostome, of Thomas, of S. Augustine, and others: so that we neede not to regard the novelties of his illustrious Lordship. Again he saith that *The answeres of Card. Baronius are not unlike* (meaning, vnto the answeres of Card. Bellarmine) who whilst he cannot finde an objected argument, able to be assoyted by History, he saith that those wordes have beene inserted into the bookes. In breefe, ^{c Ibid. pag. 300.} I will say no more (saith he) of Card. Baronius, but that he is an Historian yet lining, whose workes are suspected, where he intreateth of the Immunity (namely, of the Clergie), who, when he wanteth other support, doth dislike all Historiographers; and when he admitteth any, he singeth out the wordes which make for him, but those which make against him, he saith, were inserted by others, as it here happened in the story of Luitprandus, whose booke hath beene the space of 700. yeares approved in the Church: but hee reiecteth the authority both of this, and of other Writers of his time. Seeing therefore that his Annals (or Chronicles) have not that estimation in the world, as he supposed; and that there is a booke which will come forth shortly, intitled, The Errors of Baronius, wherein there are discovered more then twenty severall errors, which he hath committed in denying this one most ancient Historie, concerning Pope Iohn (to wit, Iohn 12. whom the godly Emperour Otto deposed) I shall not neede to say more of his authority.

19. Neyther shall I neede to adde any more to this which hath beene said, because our Reckener M^{ast}. Parsons knoweth (although we should not reckon by the strict rules of proportion, but by the remisse principles of probability onely) that if twenty errors may bee found in the compasse of three sheetes of paper, set forth by Baronius, then may we presume that many hundreth vntruths do lie lurking within his whole Annals, which containe twelue huge volumes, which, in all probability, may bewray some apparances of vnjust dealings.

SECT. III.

The loose dealing of their Iesuit Boucher, by the accusation of Barclay their owne Romish Doctor.

^a *Barclay's cont.*
Monarchom. l. 5.
c. 6. pag. 360.
^b *Bodin. l. 2. de*
Repub. cap. 5.

^c *Barclay. l. 6. c.*
20. pag. 490.

^d *L. I. de feud.*
Tit. 1.

^e *Barclay. l. 6. c.*
24. pag. 510.

20. **W**HEREAS M. ^a *Boucher* objecteth the testimony of *Bodine*, to proue that *It is lawfull for a private man to kill a lawfull King, if he shall tyrannize over his subiects*, M. *Barclay* answereth, saying, *The Author in the same Chapter doth plainly contradict you, and the wordes themselves doe openly pronounce, that you haue belyed his iudgement.* And after that he made the matter manifest, by alleaging the Author at large, he shutteth vp the point, saying, *What a mischief meaneth this manner of handling Authors?* and so proceedeth on to vrge him to confesse cyther his wilfull falshood, or else his rashnesse, in giuing credite to other mens Notes. In the next place he chargeth *Boucher* for alleaging the ^c *Suppositions and bastardly Tracts*, which are falsly fathered vpon *Tho. Aquinas*, to wit, the bookes *de Regimine Principis*, which although they be vulgarly receiued as his, yet are they fraught with such dotages and fooleries, as if they were written to mooue laughter, as ^d *Cuiacius* hath said. Finally (not to diue any deeper into this puddle-water of falsities) *Barclay* is offended with *Boucher*, for bringing in the sentence of ^e *Sarisburiensis* laymed and corrupted, which (saith *Barclay*) you must say you haue deliuered from the relation of others, or else you must needs loose your credite by the crime of forgery.

21. And now may our Reader iudge, whether M. *Parsons* haue not (as I once said) lawishly hazarded the credite of the chiefe Pillars of the Romish Church, vpon a *Triple falsitie*, as it were vpon a *Trey-trippe*, euen by the confessions of their owne Doctors. Something will be expected to be said concerning *Gratian*.

S E C T. V.

*The Falshoods which are confessed to swarme in Gratian,
the auncient compiler of the Decrees of Popes,
Fathers and Councils.*

22. **A**fterwards the zeale, which Mr. Parsons hath, for the defence of the Romish Authors, transported him to iustifie their *Gratian* also, especially in one point, wherein notwithstanding his guilt * will appeare to bee most transparant. But now in generall their owne * *Antonius Augustinus*, an Arch-bishop in Spaine, hath lately written a booke professedly for the purging of *Gratian*, whose faults he saith are *Ita multa, &c.* So many that they cannot be declared in one day: many false inscriptions of Authors; ascribing many words unto *Gregorie*, *Ambrose*, and *Augustine*: which are nowhere to be found, or not in them; producing also true Authors, but yet so, as oftentimes bringing in contrary sentences.

* See hereaftes
ca. 5. §. 3. &c.
* *Ant. Augustin*
* *Archiepiscopus*
Tarracomensis de
emend. *Gratiani*.
lib. 1. Dialog. 1.
pag. 5. Patia.
1607.

23. Afterwards he proceedeth to vnfold many particular grosse, and dangerous vntruths of *Gratian*, the Compiler of the *Decrees of Councils*, and *Popes*, and of the *Testimonies of Fathers*; a worke which for diuers hundred yeeres was admitted for the publike directorie of the Doctors of the Romish Church.

24. Heere, heere had beene a large field of falsities, for Mr. Parsons his pen to galloppe in, and to play his Rhetoricall curuets, if that his *Holy itch*, (as hee calleth such his desire to be meddling with Protestants) had not mooued him, rather to calumniate the manifest truthes of his Aduersaries, then to acknowledge the *Falsifications* committed by the Principall Authors of his owne side. If peraduenture these confessed corruptions in these their particular, but yet publike and famous Bookes, seeme not to our Reader sufficient to prooue Mr. Parsons his *Distinctive Note* to be notoriously calumnious, wee haue further to acquaint him with that which followeth.

S E C T. VI.

A generall practise of fraud in the Romish Church according as it is confessed by their owne Doctors.

^a Defens. Marsil.
cont. Bellar.
pag. 331.
A dangerous
Art of corrupt-
ing of Au-
thors.

^b Ibid. pag. 338.

25. **T**He generall practise of deceit, which now cometh into our viewe, is of two kinds: the first is their professed abuse of Authors, as is manifest, both by corrupting of their Books, & also by perverting their meanings. For evidence whereof we haue, concerning the former, the confession of their forenamed *Marsilius*. ^aIt is a matter known vnto all (saith he) that those things which were written in the behalfe of Lay Magistrates, haue bene, and still are razed out of the Councils, Canons, and Bookes of other Doctors yea out of the very Breuiaries and Missals: insomuch as it may bee feared, lest that in proesse of time, that vnlimited power of the Pope in temporall affaires will be established. So that hee that will compare the Bookes that were written in the yeere 1530. or 1550. with the writings, at this day, whether they write of Councils, or of other things he shall easily finde where the Vintage is: So that it is a marvell, that after this harvest, we found any clusters of grapes, for the defence of our prince. ^bWherby in tract of time it will come to passe, that none will giue credit vnto any writings, and that the Church of God will be overthrowen. Which I speake (saith he) vpon this occasion, which is offered by the Lord Cardinall, as also writing very earnestly, that bookes bee not depraued: which I say with all humilitie, and reuerence. *Marsilius* pursueth him further, saying, ^cIt need not be marvelled why we cannot alledge many for this opinion, he sheweth two reasons: the first is, because this question is but new: the second, because if any write freely, he is forthwith compelled to retract himself, as it hapned to the Lord Cardinall (Bellarmine) himself; or else such things are blotted out of their bookes; or else threats are cast out: insomuch that *Sotus* could say vpon the conclusion of this matter, It becommeth a seruant to thinke much, and say little.

26. Can there be any greater fraudulencie then this, or in this

this fraude, a more pernicious tyranny, against either the living, or the dead, then thus to tye, as it were, cords vnto their tongues, and compelling them to speake contrary to their meaning, so farre sometimes, as to chaunge *c* visible into *Invisible*? Besides they doe further so professe to deale with *a* *Auncient Authors*, as either to suffer many errors (so they call the opinions, when they are objected against them in dispute) or to extenuate them, or to excuse them, or else by some newe devised comment to denie them.

c Index Belgicus
per Iunium.
pag. 17.

a Index Belg. apud Pappum.
pag. 12.

27. The second kind of deceitfulnesse hath bene, belike, sensible ynough at Rome, seeing that their owne learned Doctor *Essensaus* was forced to complaine thetcof. *• When Pope Paulus 4. (saith he) did seriously affirme that hee intended to choose me into the order of Cardinals, I doe religiously sweare, that as often as I thought upon the report of obtaining the red Hat freely (which others hunted after for money, who were repulsed) I giue immortall thanks vnto God that he suffered not, I will not say so much good, but so much euill to happen vnto me: Quid facerem Romæ? mentiri nescio. What should I doe at Rome? I cannot lie. Now if Rome, which will seeme to bee the Metropolis of all sanctitie, become the Exchange of lying, we may suspect that Mr. Parsons, after his so long residence in that place, may happily haue receiued some taint. This wee may trie by the confession of his owne Romish Authors, after that we haue first heard what he will say for himselfe.*

*• Cl. Espencaus
Tract. 6. Epist.
dedic. ad Card.
Castil.*

SECT. VII.

Mr. PARSONS his protestation of his own Integritye.

Master PARSONS Reckoning.

AS for falsities, they may proceede of diuers causes, and in diuers degrees, and with sundry circumstances of more or lesse fault, so that there may be a falsitie without a falshood, whereof my meaning is nor in this place: but whosoever shall be found in a wilfull and witting falsitie, or rather falshood, that is knowen to be such by the vterer, I doe thinke it to abhorre so much from the nature it selfe of an honest

Reckon. pag. 219.

Idem pag. 214.

honest and ciuill man, as of what Religion so euer he be, he will not commit it once, much lesse thrice. As for my selfe, I stand confident, that he will neuer be able to bring any such fraud against me, much lesse thrice thrice.

The Renewe.

28. Mr. *Parsons* hath truely expressed the Character of an honest man, to wit, that he doth *alwayes abhorre all wilfull falsehood*, and he will needs Canonize himselfe, and be registred in the Calender of *honest men*. But words are but as letters, and deedes as scales: so that if Mr. *Parsons* protestation bee contradicted by his conuersation, then his writings (whereof we are to speake in the Chapters following) may be presumed to bee no truer then his other actions. And if in his morall behaiour he be a true man, then their twentie and eight Seminarie Priests were blacke Saints, who in their
 * Appeale made vnto Pope *Clement* the eight, against the factions of the Iesuits, speaking of Master *Parsons*, note, *Patrem Robertum praprium*, &c. that is, Father Robert *Parsons* the chiefe Author of these factions: And for a man, *c* Dissembling to forewarne our Messengers (say they) whom we sent vnto your Holinesse, that they might escape the hands of them that layde watch to catch them, when notwithstanding he was the principall plotter to haue them intrapped; and who, in taking their Examination, appointed a Iesuite to write downe their Answers: but so, as altering their words at his pleasure.

^a *Declaratio motuum & turbationum, que inter Iesuitas & Sacerdotes in Anglia oritur sunt.*
 Ad *Clementem*. 8. Pontificem exhibita à Sacerdotibus.
^b *Pag. 23.*
^c *Pag. 40.*

29. This, and much more to this effect, was deliuered to the Pope against Mr. *Parsons*, by a grand Inquest of their owne Priests, in their ioynt Appeale vnto him, with whom they account it a damnable sinne to lie or equivocate. The summe wherof one of their Priests in his *Quodlibets* hath expressed, saying of Mr. *Parsons*, that *He is the abstract and quintessence of all coggeries, and forgeries, &c.* *This is thus worthy excellent, that lies, dissembles, and equivocates at euery word.* Notwithstanding I desire the good Reader, that these imputations which are cast vpon him by his owne brotherhood, may not any whit preiudice his integritie, but rather to suspect

^d *Quodlib. p. 236*
^e *Quodlib. ibid.*

suspect them to be lies, except that they may bee reasonably verified by the *Renew* of his *Reckoning*.


30. Hitherto wee haue heard the censure of their owne Doctōrs, branding Authors of their owne order with the blacke marke of often falsifying; and also displaying the generall practise of their Church, in corrupting of Authors sentences, contrary to their meaning. So that this *Introduction* may serue for a reduction of Mr. *Parsons* into a more *Sober Reckoning*, who doth pronounce his brethren to be free from that *Maladie* of falsifying; not so much in confidence (as it may seeme) of their fidelitie, as for the better palliating of his owne guilt, whilest he would be thought religiously, and honestly to detest that vice, which throughout the *Renew* of this *Reckoning* I shall orderly detect.

CHAP. II.

Consisting of two Inquiries.

SECT. I.

The first.

1.  Hether Mr. *Parsons* hath not greatly obscured and abused a place of Scripture, which serueth for an infallible conuiction of the Iewish infidelitie, and for the prooofe of *Christ* his resurrection, by defending the probabilitie of that aunswere, which the * *Souldiers* gaue, * *Mar. 27.*
 "when they sayd, [*Whilest we were asleepe, his Disciples came*
 "and stole him away.] Which answere * I Iudged to be fond * *Preamb. pag.*
 "and senselesse, and am therefore called by him vnto a new 3-4. &c.
 " *Reckoning*. This is a matter of some moment, therefore I

D

neither

"neither may, nor will refuse a triall herein. I objected Saint
 "Augustine, &c. The summe of his answer followeth.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

*Reckon. cap. 1.
 §. 1 pag. 7. & 8.*

I Answer, that S. Augustine argued well against the Souldiers by a Dilemma, that if they were asleepe, they could not tell by any certaintie that Christ his Disciples stole him away, and therefore they did fondly to testifie the same for certaine and true. But Saint Augustine saith not, as you say, that the deuise was against *common sense*, for then it would not haue beene beleueed so generally, for so many yeeres after, as euen in the time when S. Matthew writ his Gospell: nor could the Priests, Doctors, and principall Iewes of the Synagogue, which had not onely *common sense*, but worldly wisedome also, either haue deuised this shift, or haue giuen money to haue it published; or would they haue suffered the same to haue beene proposed to the Gouernour Pilate, for contenting him, who being a Romane, and a wise worldly man, would neuer haue harkened vnto it: or admitted the same, if the proposition had bene against *common sense*. — I grant that the Souldiers could not know it for certaine, that the Disciples had stolne him away, but by probabilitie onely; which probabilitie notwithstanding, was very great, for that his enemies would not haue aduentured to haue done it with so great a danger. Ergo, it is likely that they were Friends, Followers, Schollers, and Disciples. — I grant that the Priests and Souldiers lied therein, but yet I hold that this lie, was not senselesse, nor against *common sense*.

*The Reueiwe, by a threefold Conuiction: the first
 is from Authoritie.*

*Aug. Tom. 10.
 Hom. 36.*

*c Chrysost. in
 Mat. 28. Hom.
 91. col. 714. Tom.
 2.*

2. Saint Augustine, by a Dilemma, brought the Souldiers vnto one of these extremities, viz. either to say that Christ is risen, and consequently to confesse that they were not a sleepe; or else (if they would needs be thought to haue been a sleepe) to graunt that they answered thry knew not what: which were, we know, very senselesse. Saint Chrysostome sheweth that the infatuation of the Iewes heerein was great, who, concerning this answer of the Souldiers [*Hee was stolne.*] (Which Mr. Parsons calleth *Greatly probable*) saith that it was *falsum, & minime probabile*, that is, *false, and no way*

way probable. The same Father calleth the Priests, who were the diuifers of that aunswere, *Impudent and audacious fellows*; whom Mr. Parsons would haue esteemed to haue been *wise and politrique*. Yea, and Iansenius, their owne ^{d Iansen. Concord. Euang. in eum locum.} Bishop, saith that the ipeech of the Souldiers was *Valde absurdus &c.* that is, *Very absurd: notwithstanding, that it was beleued of most of the Iewes, the speech being divulged among them, (as Saint Matthew noteth of his time) euen vnto this day: His reason is, because They, by their owne malice, were deliuered vp into a reprobate sense.* Shewing that the Euangelist *Matthew*, did record the generall beliefe, which the Iewes gaue vnto the Souldiers aunswere, as a speciall Argument of their infatuation and senselesnesse; which Mr. Parsons hath vrged to prooue that they aunswere, not without wisdom and policie.

The second Conuincement.

3. If wee first consider the persons, who sayd that they were a sleepe, Saint *Matthew* in the former Chapter, doth tell vs, that after the buriall of Christ, the chiefe Priests and Pharises came vnto *Pilate*, saying, ^{e Mat. 27. vers. 62. &c.} *Wee remember that this Seducer, whilst he was aliue, sayd that after three dayes, I will rise againe; Therefore they desire Pilate, to commaund that the Sepulcher should be kept untill the third day, lest perhaps (say they) his Disciples come and steale him away, and tell the people, that he is risen, and so the last error shall bee worse then the first.* *Pilate* said, you haue a Guard, goe guard it as you know, and they departing made the Sepulcher sure with the watch, and sealed the stone. Here we see that the Priests and Pharisees, who accused Christ; the Souldiers also, who apprehended and crucified him, doe all conspire together to haue a diligent watch kept at Christ his Sepulcher, and that but for three dayes, lest his Disciples should come and steale him out of the graue, and consequently, the people might be thereby (as they thought) more strongly and dangerously Seduced: yet now, after all their zeale, care, and prouidence, lest his Disciples should come

and ſteale him away: they dare report that *His Diſciples came and ſtole him away*; could this report ſeeme probable?

4. Secondly, if we could *probably* ſuppoſe that they were *aſleepe*, yet we know that the aunſwere implied two things: the firſt is a negatiue propoſition, *viz. He is not riſen*: the ſecond is an affirmatiue, *viz. His Diſciples came and ſtole him away*. If any in regard of the negatiue part, had demaunded of them, ſaying, how know you that he is not riſen? and heard them answer, ſaying, We know that hee did not riſe, becauſe *We were aſleepe*; could he iudge this Aunſwere to bee ſenſible?

5. Thirdly, if we conſider the affirmatiue part, *His Diſciples ſtole him away*, any might haue eaſily replied, ſaying, What his *Diſciples*? They were the men, who for feare ranne away from him, when they ſhould haue ſaued him from death, would they hazard themſelues, for the ſtealing away his body after that he was dead? Improbable. And adde hereunto the reaſon taken from the *wiſedome* of thoſe worldlings, it will make their Aunſwere incredible, becauſe (as their *Ianſenius* hath noted from Scripture) theſe beleeuers of the Souldiers were now deliuered vp into blindeneſſe; ſo that whiſt they would ſeeme wiſe, they were found fooles. As for example: The Souldiers ſaid they were *aſleep*, & perſwaded men, that *Chriſt is not riſen*; the Diſciples of Chriſt a while after professed, that they ſaw *Chriſt*, and preached that *he is riſen*; yet theſe *Scribes, Pharifees, Pilate* and others (whom *M. Parsons* hath renounced with the title of *wiſe, & politique men*) did rather beleeu Souldiers *Sleeping*, then the Apoſtles *Seeing*. And is not this alſo ſenſeleſſe? Let me adde the Colleſion of their owne Iſuite *Salméron*: *Who can beleene* (ſaith he) *that all the men appointed for the watch had bene aſleepe? Or how could they diſcerne that the Apoſtles tooke away his body ſeeing that they were all aſleepe?* By theſe interrogatories implying that the anſwere was ſenſeleſſe.

† *Salméron Jeſ.*
Tom. II. in eum
locum Matth.

The

The third Conuincement of M^r. PARSONS, from
his owne Contradiction.

6. We haue heard Mast. Parsons arguing, that *The Priests, Doctors, and principall Iewes of the Synagogue were worldly-wise men*, and inferring hereupon, that therefore they may not be thought to haue deuised any fond or *Senselesse* Answer: notwithstanding the same Mast. Parsons saith, that *They did fondly to testifie the same to be certainly true*. Which is all one, as if he had said with one breath, it was not possible for these *wise men* to doe *senselesly* and fondly, who notwithstanding did *fondly* and *senselesly*: Could he iustly call this a *Sober Reckoning*, wherein at the first assay he hath so fondly thwarted himselfe?

P. P. contradic-
teth himselfe.

7. Shall we summe vp this first part of the Reckoning? When we compare Reasons, there are three objected against his one, which also is such an one, as is contrary to the purpose of the Euangelist: Secondly, when we number authorities, three are produced against none: Thirdly, when we examine Mast. Parsons his own words, concerning the *wisedome* and *fondnes* of the Iewish Priests, we finde his confession to vndermine his former consequence.

8. These three Obseruations will easily prooue, that if according vnto M. Parsons his poesie of his *Reckoning*, taken out of *Dan. 5. 27.* (*viz. You are weighed in the ballance, and are found to want weight*) we be both ballanced; he will be found to be at least three drammes too light, euen in this first point of our Reckoning, and in the most cases following to haue little weight at all.

9. The next point of this *Reckoning* concerneth M. Parsons his falshood, in not acknowledging the *Clause of Reservation* to haue bene set downe in Latine: which, for auoyding of tedious repetition, I* reserue vnto a more proper place.

* Preamb. p. 5.

* See hereafter

SECT. II.

The second Inquiry.

*Preamb pag.
7 &c.

10. **C**ONCERNING a *Syllogisme*, for the which *M. Parsons* hath beene charged with intollerable arrogance and ignorance ; and now he commeth to reckon for this, but so miserably, that the Reader will pittie his perplexity, both in charging me, and in discharging himselfe. First of the summe of his charge.

MR. PARSONS *his Reckoning, by charging*
his Aduersary.

Reckon. pag. 22.
& 23.

PR. (saith T. M.) called that a *Syllogisme* which I named in a more generall terme a *Reason*, and not a *Syllogisme* : now there be many formes of Reasons, besides *Syllogismes*, neyther did I indeed intend to make an exact and formall *Syllogisme*, but only such an argument, which by due inference and deduction might prooue my Conclusion good. So he. And is not this a strange evasion in him that professeth such skill in Logike ? for that the art of Logike, to my knowledge, admitteth but foure kinds of reasoning, to wit, *Syllogismes*, *Enthymemes*, *Inductions*, and *Examples* : but this of Mr. Mortons can be none of the latter three sorts (as himselfe, I suppose, will confesse) *Ergo*, it must be the first, which is a *Syllogisme*, and consequently it is a meere shift to say here, when he is taken tripping, that he called it not a *Syllogisme* but a *Reason* : -- For there are three distinct propositions, and the first is called the *Maior*.

Ibid. pag. 24.

The Reviewe.

11. Although there be but foure generall and ordinary heads of arguing, yet ought you to haue remembred that *Logicians* doe acknowledge a kinde of Reasoning, which they cal a *Prosyllogisme*, hauing the premises consisting of superfluous termes, which notwithstanding may serue to make new Inferences, and is neyther right *Syllogisme*, *Enthymeme*, *Induction*, or *Example*, albeit all Schollers do hold it to be a tollerable manner of arguing, and yet admitteth a *Maior*.

12. As

12. As for my confused maner of reasoning, it should neuer haue beene called into question, if that I had eyther intended to make a perfect *Syllogisme*, or thought to haue mette with so captious and friuolous an Aduersarie; who talketh of often *Blushing*, whereof himselfe may haue a necessary vse in his next Answer following, which he maketh in defence of his owne *Syllogisme*, wherein he thought to expresse his best skill. I will be but brieve in the examination of his Trifles.

13. Master Parsons vnderooke to make vp a ^b True forme ^b *Mistig. pa. 475.* of a *Syllogisme*, and a good forme of reasoning, according to the rules of *Logique*: yet after his great trauell he brought forth such a mishapen creature, as he is ashamed of, as wee shall prooue. But first how will he answer to his absurdities? The summe followeth.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

IT is sufficient that they (namely the wordes, Competency of God) be necessarily and vertyually understood by the Hearer. *Reckon. pag. 28.* And for the wordes, Expressly or implicatiuely, they were necessarily vnderstood in the Maior proposition.

The Reuiew.

14. You dare not (Mr. Parsons) answer your owne *Sophisters* thus, for they would readily reple, saying, Sir, you vnderooke to make a *Syllogisme according to the rules of Logique*: but *Aristotle*, that Oracle of Reasoning, and all Logicians define *Syllogizing* to be a forme of arguing, *ἡ ἐν τριστάσει τινὶ, &c.* which consisteth of the partes, which are expressly set downe. So that he that will say, that it is a perfect forme of a *Syllogisme*, wherein any thing belonging thereunto is but verinally vnderstood, may as well proue that the picture of a mans face, which hath neither eyes nor nose, and say that it wanteth neither eyes nor nose, because any may suppose, that they should be on the face.

Mr. Parsons his
pitifull pauer-
ty in *Logique*.

15. But the most capitall fault remaineth, which is the changing of the verbe [*Maketh*] competent Iudges (which is the

the *Major proposition*) into [*Are*] *competent Judges*, in the conclusion. I expected that Mr. *Parsons* should shape vs some peece of an answer to this. Obserue (good Reader) what he saith, and thereby thou mayst discern, what a cunning *Reckoner* I am matched withall.

Mr. PARSONS his *Reckoning for another error.*

Reckon. pag. 29.

Lastly then, his third and finall quarrell against this reformed Syllogisme, is proposed by him thus: Thirdly (saith he) there should be but one *Minus Extremum*, which is, [*Swear by God*]; to which he hath adioyned another, to wit, [*expressly or implicatiuely, &c.*]

The Review.

16. *Lastly and thirdly*, M. *Parsons*? then you will perswade your Reader that this (concerning the wordes, *Expressly, &c.*) was the *Last quarrell*, as you call it, against your Syllogisme. This is as egregious a fraude, as he could easily haue committed, for in the *Preamble*, after that I had noted his *Three errors*, I added a *fourth* expressly thus: “*The fourth* (said I) *is* “*in the verbe & copula* [*Maketh*] *which is altered in the Con-* “*clusion into* [*Are*]; *then the which there cannot be a greater* “*absurdity in Syllogismes.* This was (we see) the deepest charge and the most vgly deformity in his Syllogisme, which I expressed to the full, and made it palpable by the like example “*of changing the verbe* [*Maketh*] *into* [*Are*] *thus:*

“*Preamb. p. 10.*
Mr. *Parsons* his
notorious vn-
truth which
any English
Reader may
perceiue.

“*Preamb. ibid.*

“*Euerie man, in framing his owne will and Testament*
“*[maketh] his owne Executor: but P. R. frameth his last*
“*will and Testament, Ergo P. R. [is] his owne executor.*

And now Mr. *Parsons* doth nimblely skippe ouer the *fourth* and principall part of my challenge. I will not vpon this advantage prosecute him with his owne tearmes of *Witting fraude, consenage* and *grosse lying*: I am glad to perceiue in this his dissembling, that he hath so much grace as to be ashamed of his ignorance. I tooke vpon me to reforme Mr. *Parsons* his Syllogisme by one more perfect, which hee would gladly reproue. The summe of his answer followeth.

Mr.

M^r. PARSONS his Reckoning.

I His owne new Rule may take place, that euery distinct clause must be held for a distinct *Terminus*, it will not onely haue two, but foure or fiue *termini* at least, and so will the Reader finde by looking onely vpon it. And I would prosecute the matter more at large, but I see we haue spent too much time about these trifles.

Reckon. pag 31.

The Review.

17. Is this all the Reckoning which you can make, to call a matter in question, & to put vs off only with *Ifs* and *Ands*, viz. *If you would prosecute it at large, &c.* Heretofore, where-soeuer you thought there was a cause of some reprehension of a *Sylogisme*, you could take the paines to reade a Lecture, instructing your Reader in the knowledge of the partes and termes of a *Sylogisme*, setting before him a scurrill example fraught with ridiculous scofferie: yet now, after you haue bin more then ordinarily prouoked, to proue your *Sylogisme* legitimate, or else to admit of mine for your better instruction, you referue the disquisition hereof vnto your Reader. I say no more but that you are wise.

M. Parsons free disposition to carp at that he cannot correct

18. And so it might haue become you to haue beene, in not reprehending my Reprehension of your *subdiuision*, which stood thus:

Pream. pa. 11

“ A lying Equiuocation, is that
 “ which is knowne to bee such
 “ vnto the speaker, and this is to
 “ be subdiuided, for it is
 “

{ Either a material lie, which is
 when the thing spoken is a lie
 in it selfe, but not so vnderstood
 of the speaker.
 Or, A formall lie, when the
 speaker doth know it to be fals

Here M. Parsons exacteth { A materiall lying Equiuocation,
 that I should haue said { A formall lying Equiuocation; } Reckon. p. 37.

and the omission hereof he termeth *craft*: but hee will finde out his owne folly (I doubt not) after that he hath more soberly considered, that these words, *A lying Equiuocation*, being subdiuided into these members,

His irregular taxation.

E

Materi-

^z Reckon. p. 35. *Materiall,* } the ^z Genus, viz. [*A lying Equiuocation,*]
 To equiuocate *Formall;* }
 falsely and formally is the
 worst kinde of
 lying Equiuocation.
 Here lying Equiuocation,
 is the Genus of
 his Formall,
 and Mentall.

doth necessarily inferre the members, and betoken the *Materiall* lying Equiuocation, as for Example:
 Every man is eyther { Sober, or
 { Distempered.
 Will any say that it is a *craftie Division*, because it was not expressed thus,
 Every man is eyther a { Sober man, or a
 { Distempered man?

I pray you (good Master *Parsons*) giue mee not such Reckonings, which, when they come to be scanned, must make me be indebted vnto you for correcting of your ignorance, euen in Triuiall points and in plaine Dunitable high-way.

The foure next charges.

^h Reckon. pa. 41.
 &c.

19. The foure next points, wherein *M. ^h Parsons* hath beene charged with falshood, as first concerning the allegation of the text of *Esay*; secondly the testimony of *Carerius*, about *Verè* and *Verò*; thirdly, the testimony of *Dolman*, alias *Parsons*, about the admitting of a King; fourthly, the testimony of *Otto Frisingensis*, about Pope *Gregory* the seuenth, alias *Hildebrand*, are by him repeated afterwards in their more proper places, whether we also * referre them, that we may auoyde superfluous repetitions, and finde and examine all matters at their owne proper homes.

* See hereafter, cap. 10.

CHAP. III.

*About the Question of Rebellion ; especially concerning
the Title of M. Parsons booke of Mitigation.*

SECT. I.

The Preface of M. PARSONS.



E bringeth in a scornfull fixion, in stead of sound arguments, by feigning a ridiculous conference or colloquie in a Stage-play betweene the *Mitigator* and *Moderator*: wherein he himselfe may seeme to play the Vice, &c. Reckon. c. 2. p. 76

The Review.

1. In that *Colloquie* was set downe not my fixion, but, that I may so speake, the faction of *M. Parsons* and his fellows: for both *M. Parsons* did^a commend the *Moderate Answerer* for his learned *Answer*; and the same *Moderate Answerer* did condemne all others, as insufficient, who being without the Kingdome of *Great Britaine*, should (as *M. Parsons* doth) attempt to write of these our English cases: by implication, censuring *M. Parsons* to be no better then the *Darius* in the olde Comedie, that is, a busie and troublesome body. Such an one as their owne Priest hath expressed *M. Parsons* to be, calling him a ^b *Great Polypragmon*: ^b Quodlib. p. 21
c. 120. So that he shall not neede to seeke abroad for a *Vice*. Well it were if he laid that part in iest, and not in earnest, that so he might proue onely ridiculous, and not obnoxious also, as we shall presently demonstrate. ^a Pream. p. 30.

The third Inquirie.

2. Whether Mr. *Parsons* did not betray his cause, euen by the title of his *Mitigation*? saying, *It is not possible* for his ^c Pream. p. 34.

"Romish Clients to live in obedience and subiection under his
 "Maiesie of Great Britaine. This I iudged to be a Title
 "maruelously preiudiciall vnto them, in whose behalfe hee
 "published his *Mitigation*. Let vs see how soberly M. Par-
 sons will discharge himselfe.

Master PARSONS his Reckoning.

Recko. pag. 79.

THis Inference is a meere cauilling of a seditious spirit, for that my writing aunswereth directly vnto the purport of his seditious Booke, saying, that it was impossible for Catholicke subiects to live quietly in his Maiesties Kingdome: My aunswere being then contradictorie to Mr. Mortons assertion, containing so much as was needfull to haue bene said vnto his negatiue; he saying that it was impossible, and I aunswering that it was not impossible.

A Reueriue.

** Pream. pa. 35.*

3. Soberly & quietly, good M. Parsons, & so shall you better remember that which I told you ^d before in the preamble, "and w^{ch} you haue forgottē: to wit, that howsoeuer this answer (if it were true) might confront your Aduersary T. M. against whom you writ (who said that *It is impossible* for them, whom you haue inspired, to performe due subiection) yet could it not *satisfie the States* of our land, to whom you writ, who seeke in a dutifull Allegiance, not a constrained, but a voluntarie; nor a suspicious, but a religious *possibilitie* of subiection, which alwayes (according to the Oath of Allegiance) inferreth an *impossibilitie* of being rebellious: nor can they be contented with your *may*, but with a *must* be subiect, as then I told you out of the Apostles doctrine, commanding "Every soule to submit it selfe vnto the powers that be: explained by Saint Augustine: The Apostle saying (saith he) that [*It is necessarie that we be subiect,*] lest that any might not performe this in loue, but as of cōstraint, he addeth Not for feare of wrath, but for conscience sake,] that is, not dissemblingly, but dutifully in good conscience, in loue of him (that is God) who commandeth subiection: as in another place he commandeth seruants to obey

Mr. Parsons in
Straits.

* Rom. 13.

obey their inurious Masters, but not with eye-service, as onely pleasing men, but as pleasing God. If this kinde of subiection was challenged of Christians vnder Paganish Kings and heathenish Masters, how could you but giue cause of ielousie vnto our kingdome by that your Title, which will promise no more but that [*It is not impossible to liue in subiection?*] In the end, for want of better demonstration of your good intention in that Title, you run to a similitude.

MR. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Although this [*It is not Impossible*] doe containe but in generalitie, yet doth it suppose all necessarie conditions, that are to be required for performance: As for example, If a Noble woman should resolue to depart from her husband, saying, it is impossible for me and you to liue together, the difference of our natures and conditions being considered, and that her husband should answer againe, It is not impossible: doth he not aunswere sufficiently and to the purpose? For he vnderstandeth the other circumstances included, If you beare your selfe like a wife, haue respect to both our honours, and the like. Reck. pag. 79. 80.

The Reneiwe, manifesting the absurditie of Master PARSONS his Similitude.

4. Whereas the question is, how a subiect should manifest the truth of his loyaltie vnto his King, Mr. Parsons giueth vs a Similitude, how an *Husband*, who is the Lord, shall make faith of his behaiour vnto his wife, who is the subiect. This is an absurd elusion rather then an illustration, changing the case, by altering the Sex: For an husband hath a libertie to make his equall conditions, and the terme of *possibilitie* may become him: but it is otherwise with a wife, who standeth in the obligation of subiection to her husband.

5. I propounded vnto Mr. Parsons a contrary similitude, "to wit, *If a wife, to mitigate her husbands ielousie, occasioned by her loose behaiour, should seeke to satisfie him by saying, be contented, good husband, it is not impossible for me to become an honest woman hereafter: whether her husband wold take this*" * Preamb. p. 35.

for a iust *Adiugation*. This any one may know to be an agreeable and proportionable *Similitude*, which Mr. *Parsons* hath not answered vnto; but concealed, that he might more liberally (which by his leaue, is a peece of fine craft) call my assertion *vaine* and *impertinent*: as followeth.

Mr. PARSONS Reckoning.

Reckon. ibid.

V Aine therefore is the cauillation of Mr. *Morton*, saying, that there is nothing else proued but a *possibilitie*.

The Reuerie.

6. These words, *It is not impossible*, by true equipollency, doe they signifie any more but, *It is possible*? and so *è contra*. As for example, he that should commend Mr. *Parsons* saying, *It is not impossible for him to write moderately*, saith no more, according to the rule of equipollency, but, *It is possible for him to write moderately*. I with, that Mr. *Parsons*, had looked better to his booke of *Modals*, before that he had made me this rawe Reckoning. We now come to

SECT. II.

The first Argument of the Impossibility of due subiection.

The charge against Mr. PARSONS

Adiuga. p. 24. n. 22. and Preamb. pag. 37.

“ 7. **H**E said that ‘*Christ together with the commission in spiritnall affaires, gaue vnto Peters successors a charge and oversight of temporalities in like manner, with authority to proceede against temporall Gouvernours, for defence and preservation of his spiritnall charge; whether directly, as commonly Canonists teach, or indirectly, as Diuines hold, there is no difference, but in the manner of speech: for in the thing it selfe, both parties doe agree. Heere is an aduancing of a power in temporall affaires ouer a King, which I thought could*

could no more possibly consist with the Ciuill Oath of *Allégeance* in our land, whereby all forraigne Iurisdiction in such cases is excluded, then can temporall Supremacie, and no Supremacie.

MR. PARSONS *Reckoning, for his discharge.*

WHereto I aunswere, that in beliefe and Doctrine they cannot be reconciled, but in ciuill life and conuersation and practise of due temporall obedience, they may be no lesse (for any thing touching this point) then if they were al of one Religion, if such Make-bares as these would cease to set Sedition. *Reckon. pag. 81.*

The Renewe.

8. I haue written nothing for mouing, but for remouing of Sedition, which the Title of your *Mitigation* did but onely palliate and cloake, as now in your aunswere you further bewray. *They may agree, (say you) although not in Doctrine, yet in conuersation.* If I shall replie and say, that you will not agree with vs in the Doctrine concerning Ciuill Conuersation, *Ergo*, you will not agree with vs in Ciuill Conuersation: can you possibly shape me any sensible aunswere? For seeing it is your doctrine to excommunicate and roote out all Protestants as Heretickes, whensoever there is an opportunitie to proccede against them by armes or otherwise: Shall any looke for *Grapes of Thornes, or Figges of Thistles*? Can any expect a Ciuill practise from such vnciuill and brutish positions and doctrines?

S E C T. III.

*The second Reason of Impossibility and charge
against Master Parsons.*

9. **I**T was demanded, how farre it pleased Mr. *Parsons* to extend the Papall power in temporall affaires, against such

¶ Preamb. p. 83.
out of Mitig. pag.
77. —

such as doe contradict his spirituall Iurisdiction? He tolde
 " vs that *Two Protestant Princes were excommunicated, censu-*
 " *red, and molested by the Sea Apostolike, Q. Elizabeth of Eng-*
 " *land, and K. Henrie then of Navarre, now of France: the*
 " *first of these two for the violent change of Religion which she*
 " *made in the Realme, with deprivations and imprisonments of*
 " *Catholicke Bishops, Prelates, and Clergie, &c. The other for*
 " *fearre becomming to the Crowne of France in that disposition,*
 " *wherein bee then was presumed to bee, should attempt the like*
 " *change in that great kingdome, &c.* These examples (saith
 " I) are both plaine and pregnant. A Protestant *Queene* must
 " be deprived for resisting the spirituall Iurisdiction of the
 " Pope, and a Protestant *King* must bee also deposed, least
 " peradventure he may make any resistance. Now, we see,
 " that the same Papall authoritie is by the lawes of *Greate*
 " *Britaine* as expressly excluded; their Religion suppressed,
 " their Clergie exiled, and Protestants Religion (according
 " to former proceedings) continued. All which doth ar-
 " gue as great an *Impossibilitie* of dutifull Subiection, as it is
 " for *Hinderance* and *Sufferance*; *Change*, and *Continuance*
 " of the same Religion, to be matched and married together.
 " Thus then, and now I am ready to take his Reckoning.

MR. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reckon. pag. 81.

His two next reasons of Impossibilitie are so obscurely and intri-
 cately set downe, as if he vnderstand them himselfe, it is much,
 in my opinion: for as for me, I see not, I confesse, what infe-
 rence can be made out of them, though I haue pursued them ouer with
 much attention, more then twice; and the same, I suppose, the common
 Reader will say, when he hath in like manner considered of them: for
 they concerne onely the Excommunication of *Q. Elizabeth*, and of
King Henrie the fourth of France, which censure was promulgated by
 two severall Popes of this our age, and consequently the doctrine is dan-
 gerous (saith he.) But I haue shewed now, that more then three times
 so many Protestant Princes were tolerated by other Popes. How then
 doe these examples inferre so generall a necessitie of disobedience in
 all Catholicke subiects: yea and an impossibilitie of the contrary, that
 they can be obedient.

The

The Reniue.

10. When he hath the matter so fully and plainly layde before his eyes, and is challenged to make an aunswere, hee telleth vs that he cannot see. Is this a Sober, and not rather a sorie Reckoning? Notwithstanding it was (I must needs say) a point of wisdom in him, neither to see this himselfe, nor to let it be seene of others, according to that of the Comedian, *Non sapis, si sapis*; that is, A wise man must sometime not see that which he seeth. In which Art, our Adversaries are not altogether vnexperienced, for their owne *Marfilus* noteth this to haue beene practised by Cardinall Bellarmine, Who, according to his fashion (saith ^h *Marfilus*) faigneth himselfe to bee ignorant of the force of an argument, which he cannot aunswere. Wherein they play with men, as the Philosopher, of whom we read, when hearing of a riddle, which he could not vnfold, and being vrged by one that said, *λυσον λυσον*, that is, *Loose this Difficulty, loose it*; Answered saying, *Soft a while, Sir, for were it not great madnesse in me, if I should seeke to loose that, which whilest it is bound doth so greatly vex and torment me?*

M. Parsons
wⁱcely faineth
himselfe igno-
rant.

^h Marfil. Defens.
cap 8. §. errat. 7.
pag 380.
Dissembled ig-
norance.

11. Thus it fareth with Mr. Parsons: for the reason of this *Impossibilitie* was taken not onely from the *Excommunicati- on of Princes*: but from the *Deposing* of them, and so the Reader might haue easily discerned, if Mr. Parsons, to inure his penne to deceitfulness, had not craftily concealed that point. This *deposing of Kings from their Kingdomes* inferred, as I then sayd, as much an *Impossibilitie* as *King*, and no *King*. And this consequence diuers Romish Doctors * will readily confesse to be most true.

ⁱ Preamb. p. 38.

* See hereafter.

12. When furthermore we demaund of Mr. Parsons (seeing they teach an radicatio of Princes, who will stand excommunicate) how it cometh to passe that some *Protestant Princes haue not bin molested*? He, by way of preoccupation, telleth vs that such *Protestant Princes were tolerated by other Popes*. Are not now al *Protestant Princes* much beholden to Mr. Parsons who alloweth th^e their Crowns only vpon the Popes *Tolerati- on*? He thought that I was somewhat *Obscure* in my former reason,

Mr. Parsons al-
loweth c^f safe-
tie of Prote-
stant Kings
only by a To-
leration.

but I suppose that his Clients will iudge that hee hath beene too plaine in this aunswere, in saying, that Protestant Princes haue beene but *tolerated by other Popes*: to wit, onely so long (as others haue professed) vntill they haue *power to resist*: who seeth not this aunswere to bee intolerably treacherous, allowing no better *Toleratian* of such Kings, then kings oftentimes doe in tolerating of Rebels, which is *Tolerare donec possint tollere*. So that, in very deed, the aunswere which Mr. Parsons offereth, for confutation of the objected *Impossibility* of due subiection, doth more strongly confirme it.

S E C T. IIII.

The third Argument of Impossibilitie.

The charge against Mr. PARSONS.

** Preamb. p. 38.* " 13. **T**His was taken from the practicall Bull of Pius Quintus, in *Anathematizing our late Queene*, in *depriving her of all Regall dignitie*, in *absolving her subjects from their Allegiance*; and from Mr. Parsons too tender a touch of that desperate *Powder-treason*, calling it a *Temerarious fact*, &c. For both which he is to Recken.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reckon. pag. 82. I See not what inference can be made,

The Reueiw.

Dissembled
ignorance.

14. If Mr. Parsons see not, that by dissolving of the Oath of Allegiance, there is excluded all *possibilitie* of due subiection, the fault is to be imputed rather to his will, then to his wit. The Prouerbe is, that *Blear'd eyes will not see the sunne*: And who seeth not that this conualement is guilefull? which kind of aunswering may bee called *Quiet* indeede, but no *Reckoning* at all.

The

*The fourth reason of Impossibilitie: and charge
against Master PARSONS.*

15. Whereas, by their Doctrine, it is in the Popes pleasure, to award his censure of Eradication of Protestant Kings, and of their faithfull subiects: it seemed to mee to imply an Impossibilitie of their dutifull subiection. He answered that *Min. pag. 88*
 "There is nothing in this but a *May*, which being de futuris
 "contingentibus, all remaineth in uncertaintie: which answered I iudged to be prodigious.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

I Doe not denie, nor euer did, that due prouidence and prouision ought to bee helde of future contingents, but my saying is, that it must haue due limits, lest it become hurtfull, to wit, vaine and vexing Iealousie. *Reckon. pag. 85.*

The Reuerſe.

16. It is no rare thing in Mr. Parsons to say and gainsay, according as hee findeth the season to fit. Before he made no more of the dangers, which *may insue* vpon the Popes malice against Protestants, but as a man would doe of his dreame, which he neuer considereth, before it be past. For now that *May* shall bee something: but when they speake of subiection to Protestant Kings, his *May* is but a meteor, as wee shall see.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

I Say moreouer that euery *May*, is not a *Must*. *Reckon. pag. 85.*

The Reuerſe.

17. I beleeeue you, for this your position [*Romanists may possibly bee obedient subiects.*] doth not by your doctrine inferre necessarily that they *must* be obedient, as by ordinarie experience hath beene too truely scene: but yet your *may* for the eradicating and rooting out of your opposites

m Preamb. p. 41.

doth, by your doctrine, necessarily inferre a *must*, as often as you *may* finde power to performe it, as hath beene prooued
 “ from the *m* doctrine of your Card. *Bellarmino*, saying, that
 “ such Protestant Kings *must not be suffered to raigne* : From
 “ your Doctor *Sanders*, saying, *They must be rooted out* : From
 “ your Doctor *Bouchier*, saying that *This must be done by all*
 “ *meanes possible* : and from the *Bull of Pope Urban*, practi-
 “ sing the same, and saying, *Not onely Lutheran Kings, but also*
 “ *all their fauourers must be destroyed*.

*Mr. Parsons
most strange
fraude.*

18. All these were in that Reason expressly vrged, the Au-
 thours cyted, and now *M. Parsons* hath fraudulently concea-
 led, as though this his Answer (*viz. May be, doth not inferre a*
Must) had not beene so much as thought on before. Here, if
 euer, it concerned *M. Parsons* to satisfie; but he dealeth like a
 close, subtle Merchant, who is loath to acknowledge his debt
 which he cannot possibly discharge : Is this good *Reckoning* ?
 Is it not an argument both of a desperate cause, and of a guiltie
 conscience ? Notwithstanding, in the end, as though hee
 had cleared the whole *Reckoning*, and that nothing could be
 objected against him, he addeth two other pleasant, but yet
 prodigious conceits.

The summe of Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reckon. p. 87.

TRuely in this point I see not, what probabilities may be in rea-
 son, to perswade his Maiestie that his Catholique subiects would
 not liue quietly and confidently vnder him, if they might be vsed
 as *Subiects*, and haue that Princely and Fatherly protection from him,
 which both lawes doe allow to free-borne subiects, and they may hope
 and expect from his benignity, where no personall or actual delict shal
 haue made them vnworthy thereof.

The Review.

19. *If your Catholickes (M. Parsons) may be vsed as Sub-
 iects ?* Let me entreate you for some few minutes of time, to
 take vpon you the face of an ingenuous man, and tel vs whe-
 ther you thinke them to be *vsed as Subiects*, or no ? It is like-
 ly you are of the same minde you were, when you said that
n *Hic*

"His Maiesties milde and sweete respect towards Catholikes at his first entrance, was soone by arte of their enemies auerted, long before the Conspiracie fell out, for that not onely all the most cruell Statutes and penall lawes made by Q. Elizabeth were renewed and confirmed before this, with addition of others, tending to no lesse rigour and acerbity, but also the exaction of the same was put in practise with great seuerity: Nor were mens goods and persons onely afflicted, but the lines also of sundry taken away for cause of Religion, before this Powder-Treason fell out.

"But to proceed a little further in the narration of some points of heauie persecution, which ensued soone after his Maiesties being in England, much before the Powder-treason was attempted. So you goe on, reckoning vs your Pressures, which you call Violence intollerable; New angariation; yea an huge Sea of Molestations and Exagitations. One word more. What, I pray you, do you thinke of the Powder-men; who liued at libertie in great ryote? They were halfe a score young Gentlemen put in despaire by apprehension of publique persecution, without demerit of the persecuted. Well then, it is plaine that you acknowledge no Probability of quiet Subiection in your Catholiques, towards his Maiestie, further then that they are vexed as Subiects: but (say you) they are vexed with intollerable violence, new angariations, and persecutions, without their demerit. You neede say no more, your Reader will easily vnderstand your conclusion, which giueth vs a fare-wel vnto all voluntary subiection. Thus we haue vnmasked M. Parsons, that we might see his bare face.

20. I willingly omit, as frivoulous, his next descant vpon a Red-rose, and a White: for albeit there is Now no difference of Titles betwene the Red-rose, and the White; yet is there odde betweene loyall subiection, and treasonable Positions and practises, which end in blood as redde as any Rose.

"The letter of a Catholique touching the Oath of Allegiance, p. 42.

"Pag. 43.

P. 43. 44 46.

"Mitig. pag. 50

M. Parsons betrayeth himselfe in the point of Allegiance.

"Rec. tom. pa. 87

S E C T. V.

*An Addition unto the former Impossibilities.*¹ *pream p. 42.*

21. V^Nto the former Argument I^t added, as an assistant, your professed Couert of *Mentall Reservation*, vsed by you in your examinations for a cloake of much perfidioufnesse, which worketh an *Impossibility* of discovery, and consequently addeth vnto the former *Impossibilities*.

Mr. PARSONS his *Reckoning, concerning the priuledge* of Priests and their exemptions.

Reckm. pag. 89.

T^Hat we may equiuocate before incompetent Iudges, and that the Lay-Iudges in England are incompetent to examine Priests, may be as well vsed for an argument to proue, that Lay-men and Priests cannot lue together in Spaine and Italy, and other Catholike countries, for that there also Lay-men are incompetent Iudges in Clergie-mens causes, and so are Clergy-men themselves, if they haue no lawfull Iurisdiction, or proceede not lawfully.

The Reniew.

*Equiuocating
a Priestly
prerogatiue.*

22 Thus you answered only for iustification of your Priests, we see by this the notable prerogatiue of a Romish Priest, to wit, whensoever he commeth to be examined before a Lay-Magistrate, he is priuiledged to *Equiuocate*, because *Lay-Magistrates* (according to M. Parsons doctrine) are vnto them *Iudges incompetent*.

¹ *Ioh. Marfil.
Defens. adueri.
Bellar. c. 3. p. 199
p. 200. &c
Exemption of
Priests, quæ
iure?*

23. But by what law, M. Parsons, can you pleade such an exemption? by *Diuine law*? some of your side haue so taught, but your more sober Authours dare confute them, as we read in their *Marfilus*, to wit, *The Exemption of Ecclesiasticall persons in temporall and criminall matters*, Medina rest. q. 15. a most sound and Catholique Authour saith, is not prescribed in any place of Scripture, and concludeth that it is not by *Diuine law*; Couarruias lib. pract. ca. 31. conclus. 2. is of the same opinion

nion, who is also a solid, and Catholique Author: Victoria also, and Sotus consent therewith; and so did formerly (meaning Bellarmine) the L. Cardinall himselfe. So he. It must therefore follow, that all such Exemption proceeded from humane indulgence; and may vpon humane necessity be altered againe: neither is that prerogative vniuersall: therefore it may bee that M. Parsons, when hee named *Spaine* and *Italy*, saw some cause to pretermitt *France*.

24. Howsoeuer their case may be in other Countries, yet the oddes betweene them and ours is farre different, because the Romanists doe acknowledge a power spiritual in their Bishoppes, and account them to be competent Iudges, both to examine, and also (vpon iust cause) to deliuer their Clerkes into the handes of secular Magistrates, and so vnto execution, according to the nature of their demerit: but in *England* they hold both lay and spirituall Gouvernours to bee in like cases altogether incompetent; and therefore the Argument of *Impossibilitie* is more in *England* then it can bee cyther in *Spaine* or *Italy*: yet this was the best shift that M^{ast}. Parsons could make, to confound two cases of *England* and *Spaine*, which are no lesse different then *England* and *Spaine*.

CHAP. III.

A briefe Discourse, concerning Mentall Equiuocation;
proouing that M. PARSONS, by one Grant, hath overthrowne his defence of Mentall Reseruatiō.

SECT. I.

1.



After Parsons, for the iustifying of *Mentall Equiuocation*, hath borrowed, as he calleth it, a Reason from the example of the *Foxe*, ^{Mitigation} which creature, when he is in danger of ^{cap. 9. p. 403.} hunters, is taught by the instinct of nature

to winde and turne, to trip it backward, and forward, and all to deceiue the Hunters, and to secure himselfe: So (saith hee) may man vse the arte of *Mentall Reseruatiō in some cases.*

2. This being *M. Parsons* his owne example, he may not be offended with me, if I intitle the discussing of this point, *The hunting of the Fox*, especially knowing that their owne Priest hath made bold to write thus against him: *¶ If you can procure Charles Pagets booke (saith hee) against Father Parsons, you shall finde the Foxe so vncafed, and left so naked of all honesty, wisdom, and iudgement in these points, &c. But first we will prepare our selues to the sport.*

Mr. PARSONS, his Reckoning.

Reckon. c. 2. §.
II. pag. 91.

SEe what ostentation and vaunt hee vsed at his first entrance, as though he would do great matters indeed; for thus he beginneth: That *P. R.* hath flatly overthrowne his defence of *Mentall Equiuocation*; which is made so euident, as that no wit of man can possibly excuse him. This, you see, is confidently spoken of himselfe, and his wit sheweth his Reader will finde as great want of wit and discretion in this bragge, and in the *Medium* here chosen to overthrow my whole Treatise, as euer perhaps he found in any man, professing wit and learning.

The Review.

3. I haue scene your *Reckoning* Master *Parsons*, wherein with the sweate of your braines, you haue forced your wit to defend a desperate cause with no small confidence. In the which cause, there is more neede of Grace then of Wit, but I am willing to ioyne issue with you, and to stand vnto the tryall of any indifferent Reader. Let vs begin at a beginning.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reckon. p. 92.

HE beginneth his Confutation thus: *How now would my Reader, heare this noble Equiuocator confuted? By Fathers? or by his owne Doctors? or by sensible Reasons? This will be no hard matter to performe, as I hope (God willing) to auouch in due time.* So he. And this, you see, is no otherwise then if a bare and broken Debtor, hauing beene long called vpon to pay his debts, should step forth at length in a vaunt before a multitude, saying to his Creditor, Come Sir, What sort of gold will

will you be paid in? Will you haue it in Spanish Pistolets? Portugall Cruzadoes? French Crownes? Zechinics of Venice? Dallers of Germanie? or English Angels? And his Creditor shall answer him, Sir, any kind of coyne would content mee, although it were but half-faced groats, or single-pence; so I might haue it. And that then the other should reple, as M. Morton doth here, Well I hope, God willing, to pay you in time, & so leaue him, with lesse probability of paymēt then euer before. And were this now substantial dealing for satisfaction of his Creditors? And doth not Mr. Morton the very like, that asking heere the Reader whether he would haue Fathers, Doctors, or Reasons for prooffe against me, produceth neuer a one, but saith, *that he hopeth to doe it in time!*

The Renewe.

4. Take heed, M. Parsons, your Reader will suspect that you will turne a *Trapezita* and *Banker*, for you are so skillfull in *coyne*, as though you had serued some apprenticeship in the trade: but I feare rather that you will turne a *Coyner*, yet not of money, but of phantastickall conceits, for which cause you haue beene noted by your owne fellows for *The abstract quintessence of all coynes and coggeries*, one point whereof you haue bewrayed euen in this your ridiculous figment: "For after my demand, *How my Reader would haue the Equivocator confuted? Whether by Doctors, or Fathers, or Reasons?* I added, that for the present I thought it a more glorious Victorie to confute him, (that is, M. Parsons) by his own Assertion. Wherein I dealt with M. Parsons, not as with a Creditor (for alas what credite is there in an *Equivocator*?) but as a man would doe with a coufener, whom although I might haue conuincd by witnesses and sound Arguments, yet I thought it sufficient for the present (especially in a *Preamble*) to confute him, as Christ did the *Seruus nequam*, by the wordes of his *owne mouth*.

5. Notwithstanding M. Parsons (a sober Reckoner forsooth) hath called this kind of dealing an *Arte of Mountebanks*. But, I hope, he will haue cause to say I deale not vnholly with him, when I pay him with his owne coyne; that is, whilst I confute him with his owne Answers, albeit they are sometimes (I confesse) more bare then half-faced groats.

G

The

Quadi. p. 236.

Deam. p. 43.

M. Parsons was
iustly dealt
withall.

** Luc. 19. 22.*

** Recken. p. 93.*

S E C T. II.

The state of the Question.

6. ^{¶ Pream. p. 43.} ^{¶ Act. 5.} **C** Concerning the answer of *Saphyra* in the * *Acts* *of the Apostles*, who being demanded by Saint *Peter*, whether she *Sould the Land for so much*, answered, *yea for so much*, reseruing in her minde (as it was supposed) *To give in common*, or, *To tell it vnto you*. *M. Parsons* vpon supposall of this her Reseruatiō, answered notwithstanding, *that she lyed*, and that *No clause of Reseruatiō could free her speech from a lie*. I was right glad to heare our AEquivocator confesse thus much, and hereupon haue aduentured to call his doctrine of *Mentall Equivocation* the *Arte of lying*. And so (I hope) I shall proue it to be, before that we haue ended this peece of our Reckoning.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Recko. pag. 97.

B But first how doth he proue, that she had this meaning of Reseruatiō in her minde? it is but *Mr. Mortons* imagination to ascribe it vnto her, for it may more probably be thought, that she had neuer any such cogitation, to make her speech lawfull by Reseruatiō, but absolutely to lie, which is most conforme to the text it selfe of holy Scripture, &c.

The Review.

7. This first obiection *M. Parsons* himselfe knoweth to be an idle *nappestr*, for as much as we were both of vs contented to suppose, that this woman did vse a *Mentall Reseruatiō*, and also to graunt, that (notwithstanding this her *Reseruatiō*) her speech was a *Lie*.

8. The reason why I thought she vsed a *Mentall Reseruatiō* in this clause [*With purpose to tell it vnto you*, or such like] is this: because euery one, in suppressing a truth, doth thereby purpose not to tell it vnto him, whom he would deceiue, and there-

Euery one that
lyeth hath in
his minde
some crochi-
tious Reseruatiō

therefore cannot choose but retaine that clause of Reseruati-
on, [To tell it vnto you, &c.]

9. Howsoeuer, M^{ast}. PARSONS could not but vnderstand,
that a true argument may be grounded vpon a bare suppositi-
tion, as when the Apostle said, "If an Angell from heauen
shall preach otherwise, then that which we haue preached vnto
you let him be accursed: It would not haue become any to re-
plie vpon the Apostle, saying, How doe you imagine that an
Angel from heauen can preach false doctrine? because the founda-
tion of his exhortation was not an Assertion, that an An-
gell from heauen could preach otherwise, but a supposition,
that If, or, Although an Angel from heauen should so doe:
Wherefore we agreeing in the supposall, to wit, that she vsed
a Mentall Reseruati-
on, let vs see whether our next Reckon-
ings will agree.

* Gal. 1. 8.

Master PARSONS his Reckoning.

BUT not to cut him off so short, and put him to a non-plus on the
sudden, I am content to doe him this pleasure, as to suppose with
him, that the poore woman might haue some such reseruati-
on in her minde, as M^r. MORTON imagineth, to wit, that as the Priest saith tru-
ly, I am no Priest (with obligation to tell it vnto you:) so shee might
meane, that I haue solde it for no more (to acquaint you withall) and
then I say, albeit we should admit this supposall, it is denied by vs flatly,
that these two examples were alike, as now I haue declared.

Reckon. p. 97. 98

The Renew.

10. I thanke you that you are pleased, not to recall what
you haue already graunted: I hope that you will be further-
more so good, as to declare more plainely, why, albeit the
Priest and the Woman vsed the same kinde of Reseruati-
on, yet the one may be thought to haue spoken a Truth, and the o-
ther a Lie?

M^r. PARSONS his Reckoning.

THERE was obligation in Sapphira to aunswere the truth, and in the
Hearer lawfull authority to demand it, for that hee was lawfull

Reckon. p. 98.

Judge: but neither of these two things is in the Priest, that is vnlawfully examined by the incompetent Iudge. For that as the said Iudge is no Iudge, and consequently hath no authoritie to demaund matters prejudiciall to the partie examined: so hath the other no obligation to answer directly to his intention or interrogatory. And what hath now Mr. Morton to replie to these so euident and important differences, that make the one answer lawfull, the other a lie.

The Reuiewe.

11. Then belike I haue not vnderstood you all this while.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

*Reckon. quo sup.
pag. 98. 99.*

SURELY it is a peece full thing to see how hee is puzled in this matter. First he beginneth with the person of the woman, that is, the speaker, that did vnlawfully Equiuocate vnto Saint Peter comparing her to the person of the Priest, that lawfully saith vnto an incompetent Iudge, *I am no Priest*, and findeth no greater difference betweene them: "but first, that *she is a woman*, and *he is a man*; and then that it is as *possible for a Priest to lie*, as for a woman to tell truth. But he dissembleth the maine difference now mentioned that shee had obligation to tell the truth without Equiuocation, and he not, which is the substantiall difference indeed. Here then is no plaine dealing to faulter so manifestly, in the most principall point that most imported.

The Reuiewe.

12. Heere is no plaine dealing indeed, and that will my Reader presently vnderstand: for Mr. Parsons doth charge me with *Dissembling of the maine difference*, to wit, *That shee had obligation to tell the truth without Equiuocation*, and hee not, *this being the very principall point*. And yet within the compasse of a fewe leaues following, in this his Reckoning, hee contrarily confesseth, *videlicet*. ^h *He himselfe* (to wit T. M.) doth often heere repeat, that I do hold the answer of the Priest to be true, and hers to be false; for that his was made to an incompetent Iudge, and hers to a competent, so as she was bound to answer directly vnto Saint Peters meaning. Heere Mr. Parsons confesseth that I repeated and acknowledged this substantiall difference concerning the Bond, wherewith the woman

^h *Reckon p 106.
Mr. Parsons
falshood.*

man was tied, and the Priest was not : nay I did further tell him, that whether the iudge be competent, or not competent, it altereth not the proprietie of a lie, because that truth, which (in his opinion) is supplied by *Mental Reservation*, is not suspended vpon the vnderstanding of the hearer whatsoever he be (who may conceiue or misconceiue of the speech) but vpon the agreement which the outward speech hath with the minde of the speaker. What answer will he make vnto this?

MR. PARSONS Reckoning.

WHat is this to the purpose? I grant that the truth of my answer, made vnto a iudge, dependeth not vpon the vnderstanding, conceit, or capacitie of the said iudge, but vpon the meaning of the speaker, which meaning notwithstanding is to be measured by the competencie or incompetencie of the iudge. For if the iudge be competent, then is the answerer bound to answer to his intencion, and to haue that meaning in his answer, which the iudge hath in his demand: but if he be not competent, then all this obligation ceaseth, and the speaker is free to haue what meaning he list in his answer (so that in his owne sense it be true.) And this for the reason now touched.

Reckon. pag. 100.

The Reuerse.

13. I know you are not sparing in repetitions, be so courteous as to tell vs one thing more, that we may know whether you vnderstand your selfe, or no, and then we shall proceede.

MR. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Albeit the simple difference of persons themselves, to whom wee speake, altereth not the truth or falsitie of our speech: yet some respect or relation in those persons (but especially of being a lawfull, or unlawfull iudge) may and doth alter the same wholly, making the one speech truth, and the other falsitie. And thus much for answering the force of Mr. Mortons second argument.

Reckon. pag. 102.

& pag. 35.

S E C T. III.

The Reueiw, confuting the former Paradoxe, and last refuge, which Mr. Parsons hath, viz. *The bond which a man hath to tell a truth to one doth alter that, which is otherwise a truth, into a lie.*

14. **T**Hat which you lay downe as the sole foundation, to condemne the *Woman*, & free the *Priest* from lying, is onely the obligation or bond of duetie, which she had to speake directly vnto her lawfull Iudge, whereas contrariwise he was not bound to deliuer a direct aunswere vnto a Iudge incompetent. So that the *Thesis*, which you giue vs, is this, viz: The same speech made vnto one, vnto whom I am not bound to speake directly, is true, by vertue of mentall reseruatiou; which speech being deliuered vnto an other, vnto whom I am bound to aunswere directly, is a lie, by reason, forsooth, of the obligation, which I haue not to deceiue him: which doctrine I thinke to be a new and naughtie *Paradoxe* void of all ground of truth, or light of antiquitie. Now therefore let vs follow our Game.

The first Reason for the confutation of Mr. Parsons, is taken from the vse of Verball Equiuocation.

15. If such be the vertue of a *Bond of duetie* vnto a *competent Iudge*, that it can make that outward speech to be a *Lie*, which (by reason of *Mentall Equiuocation*) was a *truth*, as it was spoken vnto a *Iudge incompetent*, vnto whom I was not bound to make a direct answere: then must there be the like vertue of the same *Bond in Verball Equiuocation*, to alter the propertie of the same true speech into a lie, which is impossible.

16. As for example. In this outward speech [*I tooke away the Popes Bull,*] the word *Bull* is equiuocall, that is, of a double signification, equally betokening the Popes written *Bull*,

Bull, which is his publike instrument, vnder his seale of lead; or his natural *Bull*, which is an horned beast, feeding in his pastures about *Rauenna*. It chaunceth that the Popes written *Bull*, which was publickely fastened vpon a pillar, for all the people of *Rauenna* to take notice of; was by some body rent and taken away: much questioning there is, who this partie might be; *Sempronius* is guiltie to himselfe of this trespassse: he is inquired after, concerning the *Bull*, by a seruant of his owne house, to whom he is not bound to make a direct answer, saying: *Sir, did not you take away the Popes Bull?* meaning the written one. *I took not* (quoth he) *the Popes Bull*, meaning, the fourefooted Bull. This later sense is true; and the speech (yea euen in Mr. *Parsons* his iudgement) is likewise true. Afterward the same *Sempronius* is demanded the same question by a competent Magistrate, vnto whom hee is bound to aunswere directly, and yet he maketh the same answer, *I took not away the Popes Bull*; in the same sense, as before, vnderstanding the horned Bull. And shall not this same sense haue the same truth? Shall it now become a lie? Impossible.

17. For albeit, that the *Obligation* and *Bond* of duety, wherewith a man is tied to aunswere vnto the one directly, though not vnto the other, haue a force to alter the speech, which was lawfull, being spoken vnto the incompetent hearer (such as was his *seruant*,) to be vnlawfull, sinnefull, and damnable, when it was spoken to a Magistrate, iustly examining him, because the examinee is bound in conscience, not to delude the Magistrate, who is the Minister and Official of God in that businesse: yet this difference of *Competent* and *Incompetent*, doth not chaunge a true speech into a lie. For there is a double kind of a true speech, the first is direct, the second indirect, as is plaine in the former *Per bull Examination* of the *Bull*, which being vnderstood of the natural *Bul*, is a truth, because that word *Bull* in that sense agreed with the vnderstanding of the Speaker, but yet an indirect truth, because it accordeth not vnto the intention of the hearer. So that, that which Mr. *Parsons* calleth the *principall difference*,
confi-

A necessary
distinction of
truth.

consisting in being *Bound*, or *not Bound*, is nothing else but the singular fallacie of Mr. *Parsons*, by confounding of two truths, and by not distinguishing an indirect truth from a lie.

18. To make this yet more familiar vnto my Reader. A boy in the Schoole, who shot at a *Hart*, which was in the Parke of a neighbour Knight, is asked thereof by his schoole-fellow, (vnto whom he is not tyed in any bond of duetie, to yeeld a direct aunswere) and he aunswereth, *I shot not at the Knights heart*, meaning, the heart which was in the Knights bodie: which sense although it be not direct, yet euen in the iudgement of Mr. *Parsons*, it is true: the same boy is asked the same question of his Schoolemaster, (who hath charge ouer him to instruct and correct him, and with whom he is bound to vse no collusion) and he aunswereth; *I shot not at the Knights Hart*, vsing the same indirect sense, as before: Afterward the fact is discovered, the Boy is whipped, and that iustly; but why? Not because he spake lesse truly vnto his Schoolemaster then vnto his Schoolefellow, but because he spake not more directly, when he was challenged thereunto by the bond of duetie and obedience.

SECT. IIII.

Another Reason, taken from Master PARSONS his Confession concerning the Clause of Reseruatiō.

19. *M* After Parsons is content to repeat my next Reason where I sayd, That "In mentall Equiuocation P. R. saith, that the Clause of Reseruatiō mixed with the outward speech, maketh but one proposition, which is as true in the mind of the Speaker, as if it were wholly delivered in the outward speech. As for example: *I am no Priest*, mixed with this clause conceiued in mind, *To sell it you*, is as true, in the iudgement of P. R. as if it had beene "without

*Recke. paros.
out of Preamb.
pag. 47.

“ without Reseruatiō fully expressed with the mouth, saying, I am no Priest, to tell it you. Now then, Say P. R. (for I meane to fetter you in your owne shacles) the woman whē she said to S. Peter, *I haue sold it but for so much*, if she had reserued in her mind this clause, *To giue it vnto you*, either had it beene, by vertue of Reseruatiō, a truth, or els (notwithstanding that Reseruatiō) it had been a lie. If the clause of Reseruatiō might haue made it a truth, then hath not P. R. said truth in concluding, *That no clause of Reseruatiō could saue it from a lie*. If contrariwise the trick of Reseruatiō could not saue it frō a lie, then doth not the reserued clause, *To tell it you*, being mixed with the outward speech, *I am no Priest*, make vp one true proposition, and consequently it must be concluded of the Priestly Equiuocation, as is heere by P. R. confessed of the womans, viz. that no clause of Reseruatiō can saue her speech from a lie. For if she had said vnto Saint Peter in plaine words, *I haue sold it but for so much, so giue it in common*, or such like, this euery one knoweth had beene a true speech: yet the saying, *I sold it for so much*, with mentall Reseruatiō, reseruing in her mind, *to giue it in common*, Or, *To tell it vnto you*, was, notwithstanding this Reseruatiō, euen by the iudgement of P. R. a flat lie. Thus farre Mr. Parsons in repeating my argument, which if he haue answered sufficient-ly, then shall I conccine better of his euill cause.

MR. PARSONS his Reckoning for his owne discharge.

THIS is his last and greatest argument, whereof, as presently you shall heare, he vaunteth exceedingly, conquering me first in his margin, writing there, *An euident conviction of P. R.* and then againe, *A plaine demonstration*: To say nothing of the fetters and shacles in the text it selfe. And I haue thought good to lay forth his whole Discourse, as it lieth together in his booke, that hereby you may see with what manner of substance he filleth vp Paper, and what sort of shacles he hath to fetter men withall, which are as strong as the nets of cobwebs: for that in this place his whole Discourse and argument is founded vpon a manifest false ground and principle, to wit, vpon the meere mistaking, or fond supposition, that the two answers of the

Reckon. pa. 106.

Priest and the Woman, viz. *I am no Priest, with obligation to tell it unto you*; And, *I sold it for no more, with obligation to give unto you*, are of equall falsitie, which we still denie, and he cannot proue: and yet himselfe doth often heere repeat, that I do hold the answer of the Priest to be true, and hers to be false, for that his was made to an incompetent Iudge, and hers to a competent: so as she was bound to have answered directly vnto Saint Peters meaning. Which being so, what needed all this long obscure speech of Mr. Morton, which might have bene spoken in foure lines; for I grant that the answers of the Priest and the Woman, do make each of them in themselves, being mixt with your Reservation, a whole perfect proposition, as if they had bene vttered without Reservation.

The Reuiewe.

20. You are exceeding tedious, M. Parsons, when will you come to the answer of the former argument, which was grounded vpon your owne Grants? The first was this: that *The clause of Reservation, mixed with the outward words, doth make a whole perfect proposition or speech, which agreeing with the minde of the Speaker, is as true (said you) as if it were wholly vttered with the mouth.* Now the womans supposed Mentall Equiuocation had bene a true speech, if it had bene wholly vttered with the mouth, thus: [*Sir, I sold it but for so much, to deliuer in common, &c.*] which, being concealed by a *Mentall Reservation*, Mr. Parsons hath called a *Lie*. Whereupon I haue inferred (and that necessarily) that the *Mixture of the Clause of Reservation with an Outward speech*, doth not of it selfe make the speech true, and consequently their doctrine of *Equiuocation*, and *Mentall Reservation* is not onely a lying Doctrine, but also a Doctrine of lying. By this time we haue him in such straits, that he must either denie his answer of *Obligation*, or els condemne his former position of *Reservation*: I doubt that Master Parsons will play vs some trick or other of his foresaid Schoolemaster Raynards the Foxe.

MR. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reckon. pa. 107.

IT is euident that the womans proposition, that she had sold her land for no more, with Obligation to give it vnto Saint Peter, or, to be spent

spent in common (this being the true effect and substance of her Answer) was a lie, whether it had beene vttered wholly together in plaine wordes, or part in speech, and part in Mentall Reseruatiō; and Master Morton doth childishly suppose and affirme, that every one knoweth, that it had beene a true speech: for albeit the wordes of S. Peter in the text of the Acts of the Apostles be, *Tell me woman, if you sold it for so much?* and her answer was, *yea for so much*, yet is it euident by the drift and circumstance of the place, that S. Peters meaning was, whether they sold it for so much, and no more; and therefore if she did equiuocate, as M. Morton will haue her, her secret meaning must needes be, that she sold it for no more, so as she was bound to vtter it, Or, giue it vnto him, Or bring it to the common purse. All which was false and a lye, in respect both of her vow, to bring the whole to the common purse, and for that S. Peter was her lawfull and competent Iudge, and she obliged thereby to tell him the truth.

A. 9.

*The Reuiew; renewing an intollerable tricke of Sophistry,
used by M. PARSONS, in peruerſing the whole
State of the Question.*

21. Marke now (good Reader) for we now come to vncouch this creature :) It was supposed that the woman said, *I sold it but for so much*, reseruing in her munde, *To giue into the common purse*, Or, *To tell it vnto you*, that is, but for so much, with any purpose to tell vnto you, or, to giue in common: which wordes if they had beene deliuered with the mouth, had (as euery one seeth) beene most true. Now Maſt. Parsons finding himſelfe driuen to an extremity, putteth into her Reseruatiō the word, *Bond*, or, *Obligation*, as though she had answered thus: *I sold it but for so much*, with this Reseruatiō, *So as bound to tell it vnto you*, Or, *With Obligation to giue in common*, inserting the word *Bond*, in her Reseruatiō, which, being deliuered with the mouth, maketh a false speech: for shee could not say without a lie, that shee was not bound to tell S. Peter what she sould it for. And thus Mr. Parsons hath altered the whole subiect of the Question, fallſly ſuppoſing a Reseruatiō, which vttered with the mouth is false; and that wittingly, because he euen in this Reckoning, where he repeateth the State of this question, as it was first laid downe by me, confesseth

M. Parsons piti-
full plunge.

* *Recken. p. 105.* I say, that I spake of * *A mentall Reseruation, mixed with the outward speech, which in the iudgement of P. R. is as true in the minde of the speaker, as if it were wholly delivered in the outward speech.* But now, by instancing in that proposition, which is in the outward speech, a flat lie. Thus, as we see, *M. Parsons* hath changed the point in question, which is the most absurd and base kinde of Sophistry that can be vsed.

22. This may appeare by a like example. Two Disputants are met together, the question to bee decided is, Whether it may be lawfull to licence *Titus* to haue a Concubine (by *Concubine* vnderstanding a Woman, who is not his married wife.) After much debating of the question, the Answerer is so miserably plunged, as, for his last Refuge, to say, that he onely defended it to be lawfull to licence *Titus* to enioy a Concubine, to whom he, is married. Would not the hearer abhorre or scorne such Sophistrie as this, whereby the Question about a woman vnmarried, is changed into the Question concerning a married wife?

An example.
 i For thus doth
Bellarmin. vnder-
 stand the word
l. 2. de Conc. c. 8.
S. 11.

i I am no Priest
 "such as I
 "should be, Or
 "such as I de-
 "fire to be, Or
 "the like. *Mi-*
tigt. c. 8. num.
55. p. 344.

23. Yet thus dealeth *M. Parsons* with mee in this present Example: For our question was of a speech, vsed in mentall Reseruation, which being vttered with the mouth, is a true speech, as when a man shall say to a competent Magistrate, *I know no such thing, with any purpose to tell it vnto you:* This, I say, is a true speech, when it is wholly and fully vttered with the mouth: and of this kinde of speech is our question propounded, as *M. Parsons* himselfe knew right well; yet now hath he turned it, as if he had said thus, *I know no such thing, as bound to tell it vnto you,* which spoken vnto a lawfull Magistrate, is certainly a lying speech.

A simile.

24. If *M. Parsons* vse to change the question in this manner, he may dispute indeede, but like a vaine man, who onely beareth the ayre: And if I should follow him in this course, we might well be represented by that Embleme of one man milking an hee Goate, and another holding vnder a Sine, resembling two such Disputers, whereof the one obiecteth nothing to the purpose, and the other answereth hee knoweth not what.

25. Although he be now in our handes, yet will we bee content to giue him more play, and trie if hee in another course can shift for himselfe. To this end I will yeeld so farre vnto M. Parsons, as to suppose with him that the *Reseruation* which the woman made, was such as he hath now pretended, to wit, [*I sold it but for so much*] reseruing in her minde [*as bound to tell it vnto you*] and also that *No clause of reseruation could saue this her speech from a lie*: All which being graunted, yet doe I now auerre as confidently as before, that this second Position is the ouerthrowe of his whole defence of *Mentall Reseruation*, as will now appeare.

A third Reason of Confutation by a Dilemma.

26. After that M. Parsons had confessed such a *Reseruation* of the woman, *which no clause of a second reseruation can saue from a lie*, and thereupon was challenged to graunt, that the manner of a Romish Priests reseruation is likewise a lie, and so the trick of *Mentall Reseruation* to bee but a lying deuise: He had no other refuge in the world, but to forge a manner of *Reseruation* of his owne, by putring in the worde *Bound*, as if the woman had answered, *I sold it but for so much*, conceiuing in her minde, *As bound to tell it vnto you*. Which speech he calleth a lie, and saith, that no clause of *Reseruation* can saue it from a lie. Reckon. p. 113.

27. Now therefore I am to pose M. Parsons, and if he answer this, I shall not call a *Mentall Equiuocator* a lyar. My question is this: If vnto that proposition [*I sold it but for so much, as bound to tell it vnto you*], she had added such clauses as these, saying, *I sold it but for so much, as bound to tell it vnto you* (Saint Peter) meaning, *As you are a private man*: Or, *As bound to tell it vnto you, meaning, with any intent to kill you*: Or, *as bound to tell it vnto you, meaning [with any desire to steale a mans cloake]*: and a thousand such like additions to the former clause of *Reseruation*: My question is, I say, whether euerie one of these additions doe make the supposed speech of the woman true or no? For if the womans speech standing thus,

The miserable
straights of Mr.
Parsons de-
fence.

I sold it but for so much, as bound to tell it vnto you (by reseruing further in minde) as you are a priuate man; make not the speech true, then is there not any case of Reseruatiō, which is not a lie, and so farewell all Mentall Reseruatiō: but if those clauses being added to her speech, doe make the first clause true, then hath Master Parsons deceiued vs, in saying that her speech was such, which no clause of Reseruatiō could free from a lie. This being the maine and substantiall point, indeede, I craue leaue to conuince M. Parsons by another Argument.

A fourth Reason, which is taken from his owne description of Mentall Equiuocation.

^m M^oding c. 3. n.
55 p. 344.

28. We will leaue the womans supposed manner of Equiuocation, and argue from M. Parsons his description of Mentall Equiuocation. ^m I say (saith M. Parsons) that in Mentall Reseruatiō the speech agreeth with the minde of the Speaker, for that I truly and really meane, that I am no Priest, in the sense which I speake it, which may be what pleaseth me, or that which I lust to frame to my selfe, so as I mean, I am no Priest, such as I should be, or such like. Here M. Parsons (speaking in the person of an Equiuocating Priest) doth tell vs, he may make a Mentall Reseruatiō of any thing that pleaseth him, or what he lust to frame in his imagination: so that it doth agree with his minde, which is as liberal a graunt, as I could require.

An example.

Now then let M. Parsons thinke with himselfe that some Priest is called in question before the Pope, by whom hee is asked, Whether he kept a Concubine, or no? The Priest although he kept a Concubine, yet answereth the Pope, saying [*I haue kept no Concubine*] reseruing in his minde [*for the use of your Holinesse.*] I would be so much beholden vnto Master Parsons, as to tell me, whether the Priest lyed in his Answer, or no? And so we shall make a short Reckoning.

29. He hath told vs, that all indirect Reseruatiō in a lawfull question, and before a competent Iudge, is a lie: because of an Obligation and Bond, which the partie hath to answer directly: he hath said also that whensoever Mentall Equiuocation

cation is true in the mind, it is as true, being vttered with the mouth. Wherefore if hee shall aunswere, that the Priests *Mentall Equiuocation* was no lie, then is he compellable to forsake his last refuge of *Bond* and *Obligation to a competent Iudge*, which he said doth make the speech a lie. But if hee aunswere that the Priests Reseruatiō in the minde was a lie, which (as is apparant) being fully declared with the mouth, is not a lie, then doth not the mentall Clause of Reseruatiō make a true mixt proposition, and consequently his maine ground of Mentall Equiuocation is quite ouerthrown.

30. Finally the summe of all this is thus much, that if the same speech, which being vttered fully with the mouth, is true; shall (as it is mixed with Reseruatiō of the mind) bee iudged a lie: then Mentall Reseruatiō and the Doctrine thereof is an Art of lying. But if that reseruatiō make the proposition true, then the *Bond* of speaking directly to a competent iudge, cannot make the speech a lie: And so his last Euation by an *Obligation to tell a truth*, is a false and lying Assertion. So that if he will but looke againe to his legges, he shall finde the *Shackles* of his owne Confessions to sticke so fast to his heeles, as although he be the most nimble heeled of all his Order, yet hee shall neuer bee able to shake them off. Thus much may serue for this present, concerning *Mentall Equiuocation*. We shall adde other conuictions in their due and proper places.

The desperate-
nesse of Mr.
Parsons de-
scent.

31. In the *Interim* I am to satisfie for my selfe, because Mr. *Parsons* obiecteth againe to me a contradiction forsooth, for that I called the woman, vnto whom *Saint Peter* sware, an *Examiner incompetent*; and yet else-where say that the same *Mayd* was competent enough, to heare a true Oath. Vpon these two strings of *Contradiction* (as they may seeme to be) he maketh himselfe Musicke, by a meere cauillation. For although that I had expressely named that *Mayd* a *Competent Iudge* or *Examiner* (as I did not) yet Mr. *Parsons* knoweth that the same word may be taken properly, and improperly: properly for him, who *by office*, hath authoritie to exact an Oath,

Reckon. p. 103.

Mr. Parsons
Cauill.

Oath, and to censure the person : but improperly, for every one that hath libertie onely to heare and to vnderstand the truth of an Oath : what can be more familiar? How often doth Mr. *Parsons* in this Reckoning require his Reader to *Iudge indifferently* betweene vs? And yet I suppose that hee holdeth not every Reader of his Booke to be properly a *Iudge*. This distinction is sufficient to breake his Fiddle, and to hinder his friuolous descant vpon words.

CHAP. V.

Of Falsities objected vnto some Romanists, and first vnto certaine Popes, alledging a false Canon, for prooue of Appeals vnto Rome.

SECT. I.

1. **M** After *Parsons*, before he came to the matter, had leysure to make a Preface vnto his after *Reckoning*, thus.

MR. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reck. 3. p. 117.

HIs hatred howsoever it was not against this or that particular man, or against their persons, yet was it against their cause, and that in such a bloody sort of Sycophancie, as included all the persons of that Religion : and therefore in fawning vpon two or three in externall words and countenance, either in person, or elsewhere, whilest in his chamber he sought by writing his spitefull, infamous, and virulent, lying Bookes to oppresse them all, and cut their throats, this measure was not good, but may be iustly called a malicious measure. And yet was this Master *Mortons* measure, for so much as no man did euer write so maliciously, to my knowledge, as he; not in so odious argument, and icalous a time.

The Reniewe.

*Mr. Parsons is
cholericke,*

2. Master *Parsons* being thus raging in his *Quiet and sober*

ber Reckoning, how would he (shall we thinke) behaue himselfe in his furious and drunken fits, if he should fall into such distempers? As for my selfe, I can say truly, as in the presence of God, that when I heard the Romish Doctrines crying (in "their generall Allarumes against Protestants) *Depose, kill, roote them out, &c.* (as I then fully prooued in one paragraphe,) and besides had considered the practized *Treasures, Rebellion, Massacres and Innasions*, together with that last * *Powder-furnace*, the inuention of the bottomlesse pit; which all of them, as so many blazing comets, presented themselves vnto me, I could not forbear but discharge my duety vnto God, and my Countrey, to the *Disconery* of such mischieuous *Positions and Practises*, not with purpose to incite vnto, but to prevent euen gulfes and floods of Christian blood; which that hatefull doctrine doth destinate vnto Protestant States. Wherein I did but onely awake men out of securitie, according to that of the Poet, *Vt ingulens homines, surgunt de nocte Latrones, Vt te ipsum serues, non expergisceris?* Horat. lib. 1. epist. 2. Which being the voice of God in nature, what spirit is that which shall call it a *measure malicious*?

3. But who is M. Parsons, that hee should thus inueigh against *Virulencie* and *Maliciousnesse*? Looke vpon him (good Reader) as thou maist see him described by their owne Priest, and then tell me what he differeth from an Edomite. * *What hath he to do* (saith a Priest, speaking of M. Parsons) *to ballast his pen with gastful goars of English blood? or to imbrow a Priestly hand in Princes bowels? O monster! &c.* And againe, * *Hee became with others* (namely An. 88.) *the trumpeter of innasion, blood, crueltie, and destruction.* The same Author proceedeth in decyphering M. Parsons his lineaments, bestowing many pages in setting forth his bloodie and cruell disposition: yet this is the *Sober Reckoner*, forsooth, who dare exclaime against *Virulencie* and *Maliciousnesse*, calling else-where my *Disconery* of the Romish crueltie a meere *Barking*. Wherein I am dealt with no otherwise then was a Lawyer in the dayes of Tully by certaine *Caecilianian Conspirators*, who called him a *Barking dogge*: but he answered, *You may not*
I be

* Nouem. 1605.

Horat. lib. 1. epist. 2.

* Quodlib. p. 238 & pag. 241. & Important Consider. per totum.

Mr. Parsons bloodie disposition.

* Ibid. pag. 234.

be offended with me, if when I see theeues and muritherers, I cannot chuse but darke.

SECT. II.

The first Inquirie.

**Preamb. p. 51.*

“4. I Haue * said, that I may not denie euen this my Ad-
 “uerſarie his commendation of Modestie, who being
 “aſhamed (we may thinke) of the Romiſh Frauds and Falſifi-
 “cations of former times, will inſiſt onely vpon ſuch mens
 “examples, as haue profeſſedly written of late againſt Prote-
 “ſtants. It were to be wiſhed that his fellow Jeſuite Coſte-
 “rus had kept himſelfe within the ſame precincts : but hee
 “maketh a more generall challenge, thus ; *Nemo haftenus*
 “*vel Princeps, vel Praeſul, vel Scriptor fuit, qui mendacij vel*
 “*mala fidei Romanos arguerit.* That is : *Neuer yet* (ſaith hee)
 “*Did any Prince, or Prelate, or Writer accuſe the Romanists of*
 “*falſhood.* I am heereupon called by Maſter Parſons to a
 ſhrewd *Reckoning*, the ſumme whereof is, as followeth.

Maſter PARSONS his Reckoning, in charging his Aduerſarie.

Reckn. pag. 121.

NOW I muſt demaund of the Reader, what he vnderſtandeth Mr.
 Morton his purpoſe to bee in this place ? Is it not to ſhew that
 Coſterus was leſſe modelt then I, forasmuch as I ſaid, *If in any one*
Catholicke writer of Controuerſies in our age, there might bee found but two or
three Examples of wilfull lying, I would neuer truſt him more : but that Coſte-
 rus went further ſaying, *That no Prince, Prelate, or writer had euer hitherto*
accuſed any Romanists of falſhood. Is not this Mr. Mortons plaine meaning
 (thinke you) as both his words and drifts doe ſhewe ? Yes truly.
 Which being ſo, I would aſke him why he did clip the Latin wordes of
 Coſterus, who ſaith, *But neuertheleſſe there was no Catholicke man hitherto,*
 (to wit, the time aſſigned, when Biſhops of Rome were Saints and
 Martyrs) *whether Prince, Biſhop, or Writer &c.* Which two wordes, *Ne-*
uertheleſſe, and Catholicke man, demonſtrate that Coſterus ſpake not of
 Romane Writers, but of Romane Biſhops and Popes.

The

The Reuiewe, and charge.

5. The words of *Coster* are, *Nemo Catholicus*: and by *Romanos*, id est, *Romanes*, he meant the *Romane* Popes, yet ipake he it indefinitely *Romanos*. And *Coster* in the words following descendeth as lowe as Pope *Damasius*, who was no *Martyr*: and the instances, which I gaue against *Coster*, were onely about Popes, and taken from the Councell of *Affricke*, which consisted of 203 Bishops, among whom Saint *Augustine* was a principall Actor. All which Catholicke Bishops, tooke exception vnto the challenge of three Popes, viz. *Sozimus*, *Boniface*, and *Celestine*, who, vpon the false pretence of a *Canon*, in the name of the Councell of *Nice*, exacted *Appeales vnto Rome*: where it is plaine that I instanced in no examples, but onely in *Romane* Popes. If I had vrged any exception taken by any, but by those whom they will confesse to haue bin Catholike Bishops; or against any *Romane* Writers, sauing onely against *Romane* Popes, then might hee haue had iust cause to note me of wilfull falshood, both in respect of the word *Catholicke*, and in the word *Romanes*. But seeing that I haue not committed any such error, what meant Mr. *Parsons* to be so violent? It may be that I haue offended him, by saying that *Coster* was lesse modest then he. I craue pardon for this fault, and hereafter I shall iudge otherwise of his *immodestie*.

M. Parsons idle
cauilling.

S E C T. III.

A second Inquirie, concerning the false Canon suggested by those Popes.

NOW he beginneth with three ancient Popes, *Zozimus*, *Boniface*, and *Celestine*, that liued in the time of S. *Augustine*, and were much commended by him for holy men, but are accused by Mr. *Morton* for fallaries, as though they had forged a *Canon* of the first Councell of *Nice*, in fauour of their owne supremacie, to proue thereby the lawfulnessse

Reckon p. 125.

of Appeals to be made to them, and to their Sea from the Bishops of *Africa*: which Canon was not found in the ordinary Copies then extant of that Councell.

*The summe of Mr PARSONS his Reckoning for
their owne discharge.*

Reckon. ibid.

First of all, howsoever this matter passed, it appertaineth little or nothing at all to our purpose, or to the question now in hand of Moderne Catholicke Writers, nor doth it prooue wilfull falshood in those three auncient Popes, if they cyted the Canon of one Councell for another of equall authority (as indeed they did): for that it might be ascribed either to the variety of Copies (when no print was yet extant) or to ouersight, forgetfulness, or to some other such defect, rather then to malice and voluntary error.

The Review.

° Pream. p. 51.

The Councell
of *Africa* a-
gainst Ap-
peales to
Rome.

(¹) *In quibus
&c.*

(²) *Lib. conc. de
Aliis conc. Car-
thag. 6.*

6. What a pace doe you vse to gallop, when you feare that any danger lieth in your way? For you saw in the *° Preamble* how three Popes, *Zozimus*, *Boniface*, and *Celestine*, at the Councell of *Carthage* in *Affricke*, did claime a right of *Appeales vnto Rome*, by vertue of a Canon of the Councell of *Nice*, as they pretended. And when all the auncient Copies of that Councell had beene diligently sought, it appeared by the testimony of three Patriarches, viz. of *Constantinople*, *Alexandria*, and *Antioch*, that (¹) *That Canon concerning Appeales vnto the Bishoppe of Rome* (as their *Lindane* speaketh) could not be found in those Copies: Or, as the Councell it selfe speaketh, (²) *Istius Concilij Affricani seu Carthaginiensis ducenti tres Episcopi tribus Papis restiterunt, & Canonem Concilij in defensionem primatus sui falsum esse deprehenderunt.* And a little after: *Concludunt tandem nemini licere ad Romanum Pontificem provocare.* That is, Two hundred and three Fathers in the Councell of *Carthage* resisted the three Popes, and found that the Canon of that Councell, brought for the defence of their Primacy was false. Therefore in the end they concluded, that it should not be lawfull for any of *Affricke* to appeale vnto the Bishop of *Rome*.

7. VVhere

7. Where you perceiuing both the authentickall Records of auncient Churches, and the diuers oppositions of so many Bishoppes of that Councell, conuincing the falshood of that obiection *Canon*, doth this appertaine *nothing to the purpose* trow you?

The summe of Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning, about the former point, in charging his Aduersarie.

BV T now to the former olde, idle, worme-eaten obiection against the Pope, for counterfeiting the said Councell of *Nice*, Although it hath beene oft answered at large by other writers, yet nothing will serue those men, but still they bring it in againe, as though it had neuer beene answered before. Which false dissimulation is heere also vsed by *Mr. Morton*, who saith not one word of any answer that euer hee saw vsed thereunto.

Reckon. p. 128.

The Review.

8. Would any *Sober* man euer haue vsed such taxation as this is, to call it a false *Dissimulation* sometime to propound plaine Histories, without particular notice of the Answeres, which our Aduersaries doe vse to make? *Mastr. Parsons* could not haue beene more iniurious eyther vnto me, or else (to omit all other his fellowes) vnto himselfe. For first I professed not a full Treatise, but onely a *Preamble* vnto a Treatise; and else-where ⁴I haue particularly set down the Answer of your Authours, together with a large replie thereunto. How then could I deserue this reproach? And (that which exceedingly argueth vnshamefastnesse in him) the matter which I alleaged out of his owne Authours, was no more then that which both he and others will confesse to be true, to wit, that the Bishoppes of *Carthage*, did renounce that pretended *Canon* as false.

M. Parsons double iniury, one to his aduersary, the other to himselfe.

⁴ *Apologia* saith *part. 2. l. 3. c. 18.* And more exactly in the *Catholicke appeale, l. 4. c. 8. &c.*

9. Secondly, *Master Parsons* in his *Three Conversions*, *Cap. 2.* for the prooue of *Transubstantiation*, &c. did cite within the compasse of foure leaues the Sentences of some Fathers, as namely of *Ambrose*, *Cyprian*, *Cyril*, *Nissene*, *Chrysostome*, *Theodoret*, *Irenaeus*, *Augustine*, *Theophilact*,

M. P. is confused by himselfe.

Ec. without acknowledgement of the *Answers*, which
 * *Peter Martyr*, * *Protestants* haue made vnto euery particular testimonie.
Zanchius, *Caluin* Will he hereupon suffer Mr. *Parsons* to fall vpon M. *Parsons*,
 and others, who are cyted and to condemne him for a false *Dissembler*, because hee pre-
 by *Bellarmin.* vpon- termitted the *Answers* which *Protestants* haue made? So
 pon this Argu- ment. shamelesse and lucklesse doth this his Accusation prouoe.
 What yet more?

Master PARSONS his Reckoning.

Recken. pag. 131.
Ec. 130.

HERE were diuers other Canons made in the Councell of *Nice*, which are not now extant, and the Canon questioned of, was in the Councell of *Sardis*, which was an Appendix of the *Nicene* Councell, which the Popes did mistake: These things haue beene discussed by fixe of our Authours, as *Card. Bellarmine*, *Baronius*, &c. whom if Mr. *Morton* had seene, as I suppose he did, though not perhaps to his contentment, why then, if he meant plainely, as often he protesteth, had he not eyther mentioned them, or else refused them, or at least wise told his Reader that ther had beene such *Answers*, although not sufficient to ouerthrow the Obiection, &c.

The Reniew.

His peruerse
dealing.

A Simile.

* *Diog. Laert.*

* *Catholicke*
appeale. l.c. 8.

10. We may reckon vnto the worldes end, if that in euery asseueration (which is *obiter*, although plainely vsed) all Obiections and *Answers* of all Authours must be necessarily produced. And to exact this in a *Preamble*, and, as it were, a preface vnto a *Treatise* (which I called an *Encounter*) is as disproportionable, as was the little Citie of *Myndas*, and the great gates thereof, which occasioned the Philosopher to cry, *Shut your Gates (ye Citizens) lest that your Citise runne out.*

11. But because he hath laid such heauie loade of false *disimulation* vpon me (as though for the terribleness of the *Answers*, I had beene affraid so much as to mention them) I shal desire him to know, that he could not haue ghesseid more fallly: for I haue already produced his Authours, discussed their Obiections from point to point, & where (if he will bee pleased to looke) he may peraduenture satisfie, or at least asswage his earnest appetite; wherein the great obiection out of *Sanders* is likewise answered. I passe on vnto the next *Taxation.*

CHAP. VI.

Of the small credite of their Gratian, and of the far lesse credite of M. Parsons in his defence, by his multiplication of fraudes.

SECT. I.

The Charge.

“ **W**hat can be said (said I) for the defence of Gratian, ^{* Pream p. 52.} who (as Card. Bellarmine witnesseth) citing a Canon of a Councell of Milenet, wherein it was decreed that none should appeale beyond the Sea, did adde of himselfe this exception Except it be unto the Apostolicke Sea of Rome; when as that Councell, in forbidding Appales beyond the Sea, did especially intend to forbid Appales to Rome? ^{* Bellar. l. 3. de Rom. Pont. c. 24. §. tertio.}

M^r. PARSONS his Reckoning.

WHereunto I answere, that if they be no better then this, they are not worth the alleaging, but only to entertaine time, and to shew your fraude in dealing. For first Gratian did liue diuers hundred yeares agoe; but we talke of Writers of our time, and of such onely is our Question and Controuersie: wherein you finding your selfe barren would now extend your Commission to all Catholike Writers of all ages past, which is a miserable shift. ^{Reckon c. 3. §. 2. pag. 107.}

The Reuiewe; noting his idle, but yet peeuisish opposition.

2. Thou supposest (gentle Reader) by this taxation, that I had cyted Gratian an old Writer in stead of a new; or that I had insisted vpon such reproofes of Gratian, and other olde Writers: But I alleaged Gratian onely, and that onely in that one place, adding withall, that ^{* Preamb p. 52.} I might alleage many such like falshoods, but the nature of a Preamble (said I) wil not suffer me to pursue olde forgeries, and P. R. doth challenge me to His crooked affection.

"instance onely in new Writers. Therefore it was but a peece of M. Parsons his hatefull zeale, to conceale my purpose, and then to call this dealing a *miserable shift*. The second part of his Reckoning is more rigid.

S E C T. II.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning, charging his *Adversarie with shifting*.

Reckon. p. 127.

SEcondly, there be so many other shifts and trickes, in cyting these few wordes, as doe make demonstration that you can cyte nothing in simplicity of truth, without some wilfull corruption, as heere where you say it was decreed (in the Councell of *Milevet*) that none should appeale beyond the Sea, you cut off craftily the wordes before cyted of the said Canon, *Inferiores Clerici*, the *inferiour Clergie-men*, as though the prohibition had beene for all (as well Bishoppes, as *Inferiour Clergie-men*) which presently we shall shew to be false.

The Review, revealing the singular fraude, which Master Parsons useth.

M. Parsons o-
ther falshood.

3. Icyted not *Gratian*, but the obiection of *Calvine* out of *Bellarmino*, and his immediate answer thereunto, where the wordes, *Inferiores Clerici*, are not mentioned: and so, to make me a falsifier, M. Parsons hath falsely foysted vpon mee those two wordes of *Gratian*, *Inferiores Clerici*. Iudge, good Reader, whether this be a fit man to talke of *Simplicity of truth*.

4. Againe if the wordes [*Inferiores Clerici*] had been cut off, yet could not this necessarily in true sense argue anyfraud; as though, where the *Inferiour Clerkes* were forbid to appeale vnto Rome, it should consequently follow, that the *Superiour Bishops* were vpon some occasions necessarily to appeale thither, because (as it is in the body of the *Councels* set forth by *Surius*) the Bishops of *Affricke* in their Epistle, writing vnto *Celestine* Bishop of Rome, and intreating him not to receiue into his communion such as had beene excommunicated by their

their Church, argued thus : that ^b *If this were so decreed concerning the Superiour Clerkes, how much more ought it to be observed concerning Bishops: VVhich consequence is flat contrary to this of M. Parsons, who still roaueth and raueth about impertinencies, to draw me from the point in question, which is onely this, whether Gratian did falsly corrupt the Canon of the Councell of Mileuet. And now we desire him to reckon for this.*

^b Conc. Affric. in Ep. ad Celest. S. 1. Surinus Tom. 1. Conc. pag. 590. col. 2.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

THirdly where you say that Gratian did adde of himselfe this exception to the Canon, you would make your Reader thinke he had added these wordes, as the wordes of the Canon it selfe, which he did not, but as a commentary or Explication of the Canon in a separate place, and so is now extant, in a distinct letter : and consequently your note in the margen, that *Gratian is a falsificator, fals vpon your selfe*, which doe falsifie his meaning. For that the most that can be objected to Gratian in this place, is that which Card. Bellarmine saith, he mistooke the true meaning and intent of that Canon of Mileuet, as though it had bene meant of Bishops, as well as of inferior Clergy-men, which is farre from the prooffe of wilfull false meaning, which may bee verie probably objected vnto M. Morton in this and many other places. For that it cannot be well thought but that he must know that he dealt iniuriously and calumniously vvith Gratian in this place.

Reckon. p. 127.

Bellar. l. 2. de Pont. c. 24. §. 3.

The Reueiwe.

5. O the wickednesse of this mans malice ! Could hee note me of wilfull falshood, yea or of falshood at all in this matter ? The wordes of Gratian, (saith M. Parsons) as they are now extant in a distinct Letter, are not added as the wordes of the Canon, but as a Commentary, &c. Is this it ? But I am sure these wordes of Gratian here spoken of, in his *Decretum*, printed An. Dom. 1519. at Paris; and another Edition at Lyons, Per Hugonem de Porta, Anno. 1548. (which two onely I then had by me) are not distinguished in a different letter : which M. Parsons well knew, who therefore opposeth onely their new Editions of Gratian (in saying, *so it is now extant*) which neither freeth their auncient Editions nor Gratian himselfe from falshood :

M. Parsons fall-
hood in impu-
ring of fal-
shood.

* Reckon. pa. 630

* See in the
place aboue
cyted.

fallshood: and yet with an hard face durst M. Parsons impute vnto me herein the note of *Fallshood*. And not so onely, but doth furthermore repeate and regilter this in a peculiar Chapter, among those, which he calleth * *New and fresh lies of M. Morton*. How can I expect any conscionable dealing from a man so peruerfly malignant?

6. Furthermore I am right sure that the wordes of *Bel-
larmine* are these; * *Gratian added vnto this Canon this excep-
tion, viz. [Except perhaps the Appeale bee made vnto Rome.]* Which exception flatly contradicteeth the principall purpose of the Canon, which forbad (saith *Bellarmino*) *Appeales be-
yond the Seas; which Decree the Affricane Bishops made prin-
cipally, because of Rome*. Here, (M. Parsons) your *Gratian*
hath neede of your helpe, for he yet lieth vnder an arrest of a
notorious falsification.

MR. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reckon. bi su-
pra.

THE most that can be objected vnto *Gratian* in this place, is, that he
mistooke the true meaning and intent of that Canon of *Milenet*.

The Reueriue.

Gratians grosse
errour.

7. Let it be so, yet so to mistake it, that when that *De-
cree* was principally made to forbid *Appeales* vnto Rome, he
should expound it to forbid *Appeales*, excepting onely vnto
Rome. If M. Parsons should chance to finde such a mistaking
in any Protestant, O what an hue and crie would he make?

a Bellar. ibid.

8. Neyther was this the errour of *Gratian* alone, for
Bellarmino (speaking not of your olde, but of your new Ro-
mish Writers) saith that *Aliqui respondent cum Gratiano,*
&c. Some there be (saith he) who answere (the objection of
Caluine) together with *Gratian, &c.* Wherefore you may put
downe this in your Reckoning, as a point confessed by *Bel-
larmine*, that *Some* amongst you haue no other shift, in answ-
ering, but so to expound a Canon of a Councell, as if it allow-
ed that, which principally, purposely, and plainly it did for-
bid: then the which there cannot bee a greater apparence of
wilfull falsification.

9. Now

9. Now that the Reckoning is made vp, we may recount the gaines which M. Parsons hath gotten, by his defense of *Gratian*. First he hath falsly put *Gratian* vpon mee, in stead of *Bellarmino*, with an intent to proue me a falsifier. Secondly, to the same end he presenteth a new Edition of *Gratian*, notwithstanding that he knew that the sentence stood, as I deliuered it, in the auncient Copies of *Gratian*. Thirdly, after all his plea he would cleare his Clyent *Gratian* from faithlesnes, in expounding a Canon of a Councell flatly contrary to the purpose of the Councell it selfe. Fourthly, hee findeth now *Some* other of their new Romanists intangled in the same falshood with *Gratian*. Fifthly, by labouring to free *Gratian* from one vnt ruth, he hath occasioned me to reueale the manifold guilt of *Gratian* in his false inscriptions, false allegations, and false Additions in such abundance, that (as their Arch-bishoppe hath confessed) *they cannot be declared in a day*. And thus M^r. Parsons (I confesse) hath euery way gained in falsities.


Mr. Parsons is
thrice guilty of
falshood.

* See aboue,
c. 1. Sect. 5.

CHAP. VII.

Of the Contradictions among other Romish Authours, one confuting another: first about the Councell of Eliberis.

SECT. I.

1.  HE Question^a was, whether the Councell of *Eliberis* did forbid the vse of *Images* in Churches? Protestants say it did: our aduersaries oppose against Protestants other expositions, but yet so, that they are still extremely Aduersaries among themselves.

^a Pream. p. 53.

MR. PARSONS *his Reckoning, in diſcharging his Romiſh Writers.*

*Reckon. cap. 3.
§. 3. pag. 135.*

THE ſtate of the queſtion is to prooue that theſe Authors lied voluntarily : you accuſe them that they haue different expoſitions vpon the ſaid Canon of the Councell of *Eliberis*, ſome vnderſtanding it one way, ſome another : but how doth this prooue that they erred wilfully ? If you proue not this, you proue nothing. And now I would aſke you, when diuers auncient Fathers in your commentaries vpon the holy Scriptures, doe ſet downe different expoſitions of hard places, euery one thinking that he goeth neareſt to the truth : may you by this condemne them all of wilfull falſhood ? Are not you aſhamed to come forth with theſe ridiculous proofes ?

The Reuiew, aunſwering his Obiection.

2. Hardly can any abſolutely charge another with wilfull falſitie, becauſe there are ſo many infirmities in a man (beſides the corruption of his will) to draw him into error, as ignorance, negligence, deſire of breuitie, beſides other their obiection in reading, ſuch as are falts in print, obſcurities of ſentences, Independences, and (which is not the leaſt) often tranſcriptions of ſentences of Authors out of one written Note-booke into an other, and ſuch like : ſo that in ſuch caſes we are compelled to ſtand moſt commonly vpon probabilities.

3. Neither doe I take the exception vnto their diuerſe Expoſitions (to aunſwere your friuolous obiection concerning the *Fathers*) but vnto the manner of their Expoſitions, “whereunto ſome of them were drawn, being (as was^b con-
“feſſed) oppreſſed with the force of their aduerſaries obiection :
“one kinde ſaying that the *Synode forbad onely an Image*
“made to repreſent God, which kind of Images (ſaith another)
“were not then in uſe. Secondly others aunſwere that it was
“becauſe they ſeemed to the Heathen to commit Idolatrie :
“Which (ſaith another) agreeeth not with the expoſition of the
“Canon. Thirdly, others affirme the cauſe to haue beene, be-
“cauſe they did commit Idolatrie : Which (ſay others) is not a-
“greeable.

^b Preamb pag.
13. 54.

“greeable. Fourthly they Forbadde (say some) *onely Images*
 “to be painted on *Walles*: wherunto others oppose, saying,
 “that *This agreeth not with the Canon*. Fifthly, *Others*, as it
 “were, oppressed with the obiection, thought it their best refuge
 “to denie the authoritie of the *Councell*.

4. Finally, after that twelue seuerall testimonies had bene
 alleadged, against which Mr. Parsons (notwithstanding his
 eagernesse) could catch no shadow of exception, hee in the
 end fixeth his teeth vpon one, which was the citation of *Se-*
nenfis, as saying, *Elibertina Synodus omnino vetuit Imaginum*
cultum, that is; *The Synode of Eliberis did absolutely forbid the*
worship of Images. And this is called by him an *Absolute lie*,
 for thus it pleaseth him to worke vpon it.

M^r. PARSONS his Reckoning, charging his
Aduersarie with falshood.

H E maketh the Latin Text of *Senensis* to speake in like manner, *Reckon. p. 139.*
Omnino vetuit Synodus Elibertina Imaginum cultum: But in him you
 shall not finde the word, *Omnino*, absolutely, wherein standeth all
 the force of the matter. And the fraud cannot seeme but wilfull, nor
 can it any way stand with the intention of *Senensis*, who saith and affir-
 meth onely (according to the interpretation which he best alloweth a-
 mong many other) that the meaning of the Councell was this, to
 forbid the vse of Images for a time, least the new conuerted Spaniards
 not being well instructed, seeing Images vpon the wallles, should think
 there were no difference betweene them and the Heathen Idols. For
 auoiding whereof, it seemed good to the Councell, for a while, to re-
 moue the vse of Images, which of it selfe they held for lawfull and pi-
 ous. This is the opinion of *Senensis*.

The Reuiewe, satisfying the former exception, both
concerning the words and sense.

5. [*The word, Omnino, is not there,*] no truely, nor yet
 the other words in their order, Whereby you might well
 know, and now conceiue that it was onely an error of tran-
 scription, which is incident vnto any that writeth, when the

^c *Catholik Ap-
peale* l. 4. c. 27.
§. 2. lit. (m)

same wordes, which were set downe by me in the *Romane* Character, as a general note of *Senensis* his meaning, are by the Transcriber altered into an *Italian* Character, whereby they seemed to be the very words of the Author himself. If you wil not credite me vpon my word, yet be so charitable as see my booke (which was published before I hard of your taxation) where, vpon the same occasion, I haue cited this testimonie of *Senensis* in the very words as they lie in the Author himselfe. *Ratio cur provinciale Concilium, &c.* Vnto which citation there can be no exception taken at all.

^a *Vasques Jes.*
li. 2. de Adorat.
disp. 5. c. 2. n. 126

6. We come to the sense. Your Iesuite *Vasquez* a Spaniard, speaking of the interpretation which I gaue concerning this Canon, citeth this sentence: ^a *Seeing that it is forbidden* (saith he) *by the law of nature to worship Images as God, and the people at that time were prone to Idolatrie, the Fathers of that Councell thought it a present remedie, if Images were taken from among them, and saith that, Martin of Ayala, and Senensis do imbrace this interpretation.* The words of *Senensis* are, that the Fathers of that Councell, *Thought that they could not otherwise heale the present disease (namely of Idolatrie) then by forbidding Images.* Which sheweth that not onely Images representing God, as some answered; as some Images painted vpon walles, for feare of contempt by Infidels, as others conceived; nor the forbidding of them to be painted in tables, as some els fancied, but as *Senensis* saith, *There was no other remedie, but to remoue them,* that is absolutely not to vie them.

^e *Polydorus de*
Inuent. rerum.
l. 6. c. 13. printed
Ann. 1558.
and Cassander
Consult. Art. 1.

7. Albeit, Images were forbid only for that time, whilest the people of Spaine was prone to Idolatrie: yet when are not people naturally so addicted? I would to God you could excuse your owne people, who (to omit auncient times) how prone, nay how much plunged they haue beene in Idolatrie, your owne Authors by their complaints haue acknowledged: and what their disposition is at this day, the Image at *Loretto*, and other such like, if they could speake, would relate to your conuiction. It sufficeth, that Images are to be absolutely remooued, whensoever there is great daunger of *Idolatrie*. And vnderstand by the way, you that obiect

object *[omnis]* so sinislerly; * your owne plaine and inexcusable bodge in putting in *[omnes]* into the sentence of *Cal-nine*, flatly contrary to his meaning. * See hereafter chap. 12. § 1.

S E C T. II.

Their next Contradictions about the Councell of Francford, concerning the worship of Images.

8. **D**iuers were objected in the Preamble, which required some reasonable Reckoning, but Mr. Parsons turneth all into a scorne.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

WHat is this to the purpose then, to proue that these Authors did erre wittingly against their conscience? Doe you not see that still the poore man runneth quite from the purpose, and hath nothing to say to the effect he should say? *Reck. c. 3. § 4. p. 141.*

The Reuiewe.

9. You were loath to expresse the particulars, least your Reader might perceiue what silly Reckonings you vse to make. I am therefore constrained to call them to your remembrance. ^a There we heard your ^b *Surius*, charging Protestants of so *Incredible impudencie*, and maruelling that "they dare appeare in the presence of any honest man, because "they corrupted the Councell of Francford, as though it had "condemned the second Councell of Nice, for decreeing the "worshipping of Images, when as by the iust iudgement of God "their fraude was made manifest, for they forgot to raze out "Constantinople, and to place in the stead thereof the Councell "of Nice. So farre *Surius*. A man would thinke, that so deepe an accusation as this should not want some colour, and "yet behold, *The sentence of Surius cannot stand*, saith their Ieruite *Vasquez*, which he proueth (as his owne words are)

^a *Preamb. pa 56.*
^b *Surius prel. in Syn. Francof.*

Surius his slanderous falsehood.

^c *Valuel de Adorat. l. 2. cap. 5. num. 225.*

from

“from all *Historians*. Yet this so impudent a slander against Protestants, when it is objected vnto Mr. *Parsons*, he maketh a quiet *Reckoning* of it, and passeth it ouer as *nothing* to the purpose.

10. Others haue deuised other aunsweres, such as were
^a *Binius in banc Synod. pa. 429.*
^c *Coster. Encirid. cap. 13.*
^e *Bellar. l. 2. de Concil. c. 8. and Baron. ut refert. Binius Comm. in Francf. Synod. pag. 391.*
^f *Ut refert Bellar. quo supra.*

“^a *Alanus Copus, Saunders, Suarez*, who say that *The Councell of Francford* did not condemne the second Councell of *Nice*. Notwithstanding the ^e Cardinals *Bellarmino & Baronius* doe acknowledge that that Councell of *Nice* was condemned in the Councell of *Francford*. And yet Mr. *Parsons* will haue this also to be to no purpose.

^g *Vasquez quo supra.*

11. Againe, a third sort (to wit, ⁱ *Platina, Blondus*, and ^j *Sabellicus*) granting that the Synode *Francford* condemned the Synode, which the *Greekes* call the seventh generall one; not for decreeing that Images shuld be adored: but that they should be remoored: which is flat contrary to the words of the Synode of *Franckford*, as is acknowledged by their Iesu-
^k *ite Vasquez*, *Quam pro adorandis imaginibus fecerunt*, which was made for adoring of Images. Neuertheless Mr. *Parsons* will not thinke this to be any thing to the purpose.

^h *Bellar. quo supra.*
^l *Baronius apud Binius quo supra.*

12. Their last refuge is this, that ^h *The Synode of Francford* was deceived, in thinking that the Synode of *Nice* decreed any unlawfull worship of Images, and so did erre in condemning it. Which last aunswere serued me to make a demaund, which I am now to reckon for, with Mr. *Parsons*.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

^m *Recko. pag. 142.*

ANd Mr. *Morten* doth fondly insult, when he biddeth his Aduersarie P. R. to tell him in good earnest, if the Fathers of the Councell of *Francford*, iudging that second Councell of *Nice*, confirmed by the Pope, did erre in defending the use of Images, did they erre in saith or no? Whereunto I aunswere, &c.

The Reuiewe.

13. Soft Sir, whereunto will you aunswere? I propound
 “*ded*

ded a full Argument, adding that *If the Councell of Francford did erre in faith, in condemning the other of Nice, then your Bellarmine and Baronius have deceived vs, who sayd that it erred but in fact: but if it erred not in faith, when it condemned that Councell, which the Pope confirmed for the worship of Images, then to cōdemne the definition of the Pope, for the worship of Images, is no error of Faith.* This your simplicitie would not expresse, but make an abrupt answere, saying, that it was an error of *Fact*, not of *Faith*, Let vs heare it.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

THe Fathers of the Councell of *Francford* erred in *Fact*, and not in *Faith*, being informed that the Councell of *Nice*, had determined that which it did not, to wit, that diuine honour was given vnto Images; for if they had beene informed of the truth, they would not haue contradicted it, as neither if they had known that the Pope had confirmed it, would they haue doubted of the authoritie thereof. Reckon. pag. 142.

The Reueiwe.

14. Then, belike the Fathers of the Councell of *Francford* did not know that *Pope Adrian* had confirmed the second Councell of *Nice*.

Master PARSONS his Reckoning.

IT is a witting error in *M. Morton* to say that they of *Francford* knew that the Councell of *Nice*, was confirmed by the Pope. But *Mr. Morton* would deceiue vs by craft and subtiltie. Reckon. quosup.

The Reueiwe.

15. Except that *Master Parsons* had prostituted his conscience vnto iniurious dealing, hee would neuer, against his perfect knowledge, haue thus accused me of *Witting craft and deceit*. For first hee was not ignorant that *Adrian* the Pope did confirme the second Councell of *Nice*, as their Iesuite *Vasquez* did witnesse. Secondly, hee saw me "further alleadge out of the same Iesuite that *The Councell of* ⁱ Synodus Septima (which is called Nicæna secunda) ab Adriano approbata fuit. Balquez Iesl. 2. disp. 7. c. 5. n. 233 & Pream. pa. 58.

M. Parsons will
full false im-
putation of
falshood.

* Iud. vers. 9.

* See the place
of Vasquez a-
boue cited.

"Francford could not be ignorant of the decree of the second
"Councell of Nice, because that the Legates of Pope Adrian
"were present in that Councell, as all Histories doe write (saith
"he) and the subscriptions doe demonstrate. These two, viz. that
"Pope Adrian did confirme the second Councell of Nice in the
"Decree of Images: And then this, The Councell of Franc-
"ford could not be ignorant of the confirmation therof; being
both put together, doe inferre that The Councell of Francford
could not be ignorant that the Pope had confirmed the Decree
of the second Councell of Nice. How then could hee call
such proofes (which are taken out of their owne Authors,
and layd so visibly before his eyes) a witting error, craft, and
deceit? whereunto although I shall not answer, as the Arch-
angell did vnto the Diuell, saying, * *The Lord rebuke thee*;
yet must he giue me leaue to say, *God forgive thee*: for I poin-
ted directly in my * Preamble vnto this place of Vasquez,
which Mr. Parsons subtilly concealeth, and according to his
woont, faceth out the matter with a false imputation of fals-
hood: yet least he might seeme to haue erred without reason,
hee vseth an Argument.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reckon. pag. 143.

FOR the *Caroline* Bookes themselves, euen as they are set out by the
Centuriators, doe vse that for a principall argument on the behalfe
of the Councell of Francford, to impugn the *Nicene* Councell, for
that they supposed that the said *Nicene* Council was not confirmed by
Adrian the Pope, wherein they were deceived by false information, I
meane, those of Francford: but Mr. Morton would deceiue vs by craft
and subtiltie.

The Reniewe.

16. He talketh of craft, telling vs of the *Caroline* Bookes
(mentioned by the *Centurists*) how they supposed that the se-
cond Councell of Nice was not confirmed by Adrian, without
quoting the direct place: wherein he hath committed as great
a falshood, as may serue to giue him his owne true denomi-
nation. For if we shall consult with the *Centurists* themselves,
they

¹ Cent. 8. cap 8.
vol. 639.

they will tell vs; that Pope Adrian did rule by his Legates in the second Councell of Nice, which he afterward did approve: whereunto the Legates of the Pope doe require a subscription, but the Decree goeth against the sentence of Pope Adrian, and concluded that the adoration of Images is wicked, and condemned that Councell, which Pope Adrian held to be vniuersall. And more then this to that purpose, I doe not finde. I proceede.

S E C T. III.

The Contradictory aunsweres of Romish writers, about the Epistle of Epiphanius, against Images.

“ 17. **T**He matter ^mis, whether Epiphanius did not condemn the worship of Images? Their contradictory aunsweres are many and memorable. ^{m Pream. p. 59.}

M^r. PARSONS his Reckoning.

IT is to be noted, as before, that whatsoever difference of opinions there be, or may be among Catholicke Writers of Controuersie, about the true meaning of Saint Epiphanius in this place, yet is it nothing at all to Mr. Mortons purpose, who is bound to proue that they wrote against their owne knowledge and conscience, which I suppose were hard to do, for that euery man must haue bin presumed to haue written according as his iudgement gaue him, and consequently that all this, which M. Morton hath so studiously gathered together, is *nihil ad rhombum*, nothing to the purpose: and therefore I could not but laugh, when I read his conclusion of this Instance, saying, *That if P. R. shall desire so.* (instances) of this kind, I bind my selfe (saith he) vnto him, by a faithfull protestation; which I belecue, yea if it were 5000. in a weekes warning. ^{Reckon. p. 159.}

The Review.

18. It is well, that your Church is so richly fraught with such Contradictions, which if they seeme not vnto you very ougly, why did you conceale them? The Epistle of Epiphanius. ^{Epiphani. Epist. ad Ioh. Hiero. &c.}

nims is obiected by Protestants, wherein hee is ſaid to haue
 " ſcene hanging in a Church an Image, as it were of *Chriſt*, or
 " of ſome Saint, and to haue taken and rent it, as being an a-
 " buſe contrary unto the authority of holy Scriptures. Will you
 " ſee what tripping and ſkipping your Authours make, to
 " free themſelues from this obiection? One thus; ^b Epipha-
 " nius did it in a zeale, but not according to knowledge, all for
 " feare of the error of the Anthropomorphites, who ſought
 " to haue an Image of God; but it is confuted by ^c *Vasquez*,
 " as being repugnant unto the text, which nameth the Image
 " of a man. A ſecond thus: ^d It was the Image of no Saint,
 " but of a prophane man. But the text ſaith, As it were of *Chriſt*,
 " or of ſome Saint: and therefore this aunſwere is reiectd by
 " ^e *Bellermine*, as leſſe common and true. A ^f third is displea-
 " ſed with *Epiphanius*, and therefore cenſureth the fact to be er-
 " roneous: but ^g *Vasquez*, vpon another conceite, ſaith, that
 " *Epiphanius* did well in renting the picture. A ^h fourth ſort be-
 " take themſelues vnto this refuge, ſaying that *The wordes of*
 " *that Epiſtle of Epiphanius are counterfeit*: but the cauſe, why
 " they were glad to make this ſhift, is made plaine by their
 " *Vasquez*; *They, being oppreſſed* (ſaith he) *with the difficulty of*
 " *the obiection, returned this Anſwere*. But what if it be not
 " a counterfeit Epiſtle? Now commeth their Ieſuite *Valentia*
 " in the laſt rancke, ſaying, ^k *Yet we aunſwere that the Church*
 " *is of greater authority then Epiphanius*. Very good: but *E-*
 " *piphanius* condemned the vſe of Images, as being contrary
 " unto Scripture, which he ſpake according to the iudgement of
 " the Church of his time.

19. Theſe ſo many, ſo contradictory and ſo violent An-
 ſweres, ſo really confuting one another, for the auoyding of
 but one obiection, what can they poſſibly bewray, but diſtor-
 ted wits, eſpecially ſeeing that it may be preſumed of the moſt,
 that they were driuen thereunto by force, as men oppreſſed (as
 ſome are ſaid to haue beene) *with the difficulty of the Obie-*
ction?

20. Notwithſtanding, *M. Parsons* denieth not, but plain-
 ly confeſſeth, that *ſine thouſand* ſuch like inſtances of their
 con-

^b *VValdenſ.*
Tom. 7. Tit. 19.
cap. 157.

^c *Lib. 2. de Ado-*
rat. diſp. 3. c. 3.

^d *Vaſq. ibid. c. 4.*

^e *L. 2. de triumph*
Eccleſ. cap. 9.

^f *Alphonſ. de*
Caſtro Hareſ.

Tit. Imago.

^g *Quo ſuprà.*

^h *Alagus, & San-*
derus, ut reſert

Vaſq. quo ſuprà

ⁱ *& Coſterus En-*
chirid. cap. 13.

^j *Vaſquez quo*
ſuprà, cap. 4.

^k *Valent. leſ.*

contradictorie Answeres may be collected out of the Romish Writers *in a weeke*: and these kinde of contradictions seeme to him to be a matter to be laughed at. Can there bee any *Sobriety* in such a *Laughter*? or could he haue more preiudiced the Romish profession? For if our Aduersaries in satisfying of the Arguments of Protestants, in points of this nature, be thus inforced to thwart and contradict one another, what can more bewray the desperatenesse of their cause? Now followeth the last contradiction about this Question.

Admirable
swarmes of
contradictions
confessed by
M. Parsons, to
be amongst
their Doctors.

*whether part of the Epistle of Epiphanius
were counterfeited?*

21. *Bellarmine, Valentin, Suarez, among other Reasons, *Pream.pa. 60.
"to proue it was fictitious, do vse these two: one is because,
"that *Of the Epistle of Epiphanius vnto Iohn Bishop of Hieru-* 1 Bellar. l. 2. de
"salem, being almost wholly translated by S. Hierome in his E- Eccies. triumph.
"pistle to Pamachius, hath not in it that part, Cum venissem ca. 9.
"Anablaatha, concerning that Image. This Answer was con-
"futed by their^m Vasquez, who sheweth this Reason to bee m Vasquez Ies.
In firme. l. 2 de Adorat.

22. An other answer is^{vsed} from Senensis, to wir, o Because disp. 5. c. 3. p. 244
"Damascene said that that Epistle was counterfeited. Which is n Pream. pa. 61.
a meere fallacie, and so acknowledged by your Vasquez, she- o Senens. bibl. l.
"wing that: *Damascene spoke not of the Epistle of Epiphani-* 5. Annot. 247.
"us, written vnto Iohn of Hierusalem (which conteyneth the f Vasquez quo
"History of the Image) but of the Epistle which Epiphanius supra. p. 241.
"writ vnto Theodosius. Where we still see, that their great
Doctors haue committed two notable vntruths, to proue one, Two notable
viz. The Historie of the Image to be counterfeited. Now let vs vntruths.
see how M.^r Parsons will reckon hereabout,

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

I With the Reader, that whereas Card. Bellarmine is here calumniated Reckon. p. 148.
about Epiphanius Epistle, translated by S. Hierome for denying the last
clause thereof to be his, he repaire, for the solution thereof, vnto
Card. Barenus, who more largely detecteth the fraude, then is expedi- Tom. 4. Annot. 392
ent for me at this present to relate: especially for so much as I am to
finis.

pass to other particular calumniationes against Card. Bellarmine, in his very next Example or instance.

The Reniewe.

M. Parsons forward Calumniation.

* Valsq Iesl 2.
de Adorat. 6. 7.

M. Parsons vniust Calumniation.

23. Whither hasten you so fast, M. Parsons? Let vs haue one word more, I pray you, before wee end this *Reckoning*: Tell me but with what reason you said, that I haue calumniated Bellarmine? That which I obiected was the testimony of your owne Iesuite Vasquez, who bestoweth a particular Chapter, in confuting the Obiections which are vsed by Romish Authours, for prooffe that that part of the Epistle of Epiphanius was supposititious and counterfeit; promising to *Shew Singulas rationes, &c.* That is, *That all the Reasons, which some Doctors of late doe vse, for the disabling of that Epistle, are infirme, and of no validity.* Thus we still see Romanists contradicted by themselves; Card. Bellarmine his debt doth hang still on the score vndischarged; and so doth M^r. Parsons his calumnious and vniust dealing, in obiecting calumniation against me.

CHAP. VIII.

Instances against Card. Bellarmine his Slanders, The first whether Caluinists be Pelagian Heretickes, in the point of Originall Sinne.

SECT. I.

The Charge.

* Preamb. p. 63:
(1) Pelagiani,
Erc. Bellar. l. 4.
de Eccles. Milit.
c. 9. §. Pelagiani
(2) Hic proprius
vs &c. Val. Iesl
de orig. pecc. c. 2.



IRST I* asked with what conscience Bellarmine could charge Caluine with the Heresie of the (1) Pelagians, who denied that there was any originall sinne in Infants, especially being the children of faithful Parents? For as he could not be ignorant that (2) This doctrine of denying originall sinne was (as their owne

"Iesuite

"Iesuite confesse th) the proper heresie of the Pelagians. And
 "not so onely, but saith furthermore that (3) *Caluine and all* (3) *Caluinus,*
 "other Protestants are so farre from denyng originall sin, that &c. *Idem. ib.*
 "they doe monstrously extend the nature thereof, euen vnto in princ. & c. 3.
 "persons regenerate: so it could not be but he must haue vnder- & in Tom. 2.
 stood, that *Caluine* was a greater Aduersarie vnto the Pe- disp 6 q. 11.
 lagian, then is any Romanist that can be named. Hereunto M. punct. 1.
Parsons answereth.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Bellarmino is guilefully abused by M. *Morton*, in setting downe his *Reckon. ca. 3. §. 7.*
 opinion, as though he had said that *Caluine* had denied with the pa. 155.
Pelagians, that there is any originall sinne at all in Infants, though
 lesse in the children of the faithfull, cyting his Latine wordes in the
 margent pueruilly thus: *Pelagiani docebant, non esse in hominibus peccatum*
originale, & precipue in filijs fidelium; idem docent Caluinus & Bucerus.
 The *Pelagians* did teach, that there was not originall sinne in men, and
 especially in the children of the faithfull. The same doe teach *Caluine*,
 and *Bucer*. Thus he.

The Review.

2. *Bellarmino* his wordes stand thus: *Pelagiani, &c.*
 That is, ^a *The Pelagians taught two things, First, that there is no*
originall sin, especially in the children of the faithfull; and of this
 first he addeth, *Primum, &c.* That is, *This first opinion Zwing-*
lius, Bucer, and Caluine doe plainly teach; which wordes M.
Parsons cut off: *Bellarmino* addeth, that *Zwinglius* did absolute-
 ly denie originall sinne in euery man, but *Caluin* and *Bucer* onely
 in the children of the faithfull, who are (say they) holy, and saved
 without baptisme. VVhere we see, that *Bellarmino*, speaking of
 these two, the first that *There is no originall sinne*; the second, ^{A Calumnious}
 that *There is no originall sinne in the children of faithfull Pa-*
rents; doth make both to be the heresie of the *Pelagians*. Taxation.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning

Aske T. M. with what conscience could he falsifie *Bellarmino*, in making him say that which he did not, for that he saith not absolutely
 that *Caluine* denied all originall sinne in all Infants, but onely in the
 children of the faithfull. *Reckon. id.*

The

The Review.

3. VVhy doth P.R. obieſt this? where haue I ſaid that *Bellarmino* affirmed abſolutely, that *Caluine* denyed all originall ſinne in all *Infants*? but I haue alleaged him pertinently, as I haue ſhown; and do now further auerre in the behalf of *Caluine*, that *Bellarmino*, by affirming that *Caluine* did denie originall ſinne in any kind of *Infants*, whether they be the children of Infidels or Chriſtians, doth ſlanderouſly traduce *Caluine*, to draw him violently into the error of *Pelagianisme*; which hereſie *Caluine* abhorred and deteſted as graceleſſe and damnable: which M. *Parſons* himſelfe might haue ſeene, if he had not looked vpon him onely with his left eye; as will now perfectly appeare.

Euidēt proofes that Caluine hath bene ſlandered by Bellarmino; and Proteſtants are generally freed from Pelagianisme in this point by their owne Vrges, and that according to the iudgement of the Councell of Trent.

4. *Bellarmino* hath deliuered his iudgement vpon *Caluine*, ſaying that *Caluine* denyed originall ſinne in the children of the faithfull: which I take to be an vnconſcionable Slaunder.

^b *Inſtit.* l. 2. c. 1.
§. 4. & 5.

Caluins iudgement.

^c *Ibid.* §. 7.

5. For firſt^b *Caluine* ſpendeth foure Sections in confutation of this doctrine, proouing that euery childe of *Adam* is borne in originall ſinne, from the example of *Dauid*, ſaying, that he was borne in iniquity, and conceived in ſinne: and as if he had ſought to ſtoppe the mouth of all Slanderers, hee expreſſely confuteth the *Pelagians* doctrine, euen in this very point, *Quod autem, &c.* That is, ^c But that the cauelling *Pelagians* do ſay (ſaith he) that it is not likely, that children ſhould draw any corruption from godly Parents, from whom they doe rather receiue purity, it is eaſily confuted, for they (that is, the children) doe not deſcend from their ſpiritual, but from their carnall generation. Wherefore as *Saint Auguſtine* ſaith, whether the Parents be guilty, and in the ſtate of Infidelity, or being in the faith, be ab-

ſolved

solued, both of them beget no free children, but guilty. Furthermore in that they partake of the parents sanctitie, it is the special blessing of God, which doth not hinder but that the vnnersall course of mankind goeth before, for guilt is from nature, but sanctification proceedeth from spirituall grace. Wherein we see, that there is as much difference betweene the *Pelagians* and *Calvine*, as there is betweene nature and Grace.

6. Secondly, to consult with his Accusers: although that *Bellarmino* and *Valentia* (but not ^d In the very same place by me alleaged, as *M. Parsons* pretendeth, but about three leaues after) doe object the former heresie, Denying originall sinne in the children of faithfull Parents: yet doe they not allége any such wordes out of all his workes. The onely reason, which *Bellarmino* hath, is, Because he saith that the children of faithfull parents are sanctified and saved without baptisme: but *Bellarmino* else-where, reckoning vp the opinion of some of his owne Doctors, concerning some children vn baptized, saith thus; *Caietane*, *Gabriel*, *Gerson*, *Catharine*, and some other *Catholikes* say, th at it is contrary to the mercie of God, that all children, which die without Baptisme, should perish. Among others who were of the same opinion, are reckoned *Tilmannus*, *Sigebertensis*, *Tho*, *Elisius*, and *Cassander*, all affirming that although Infants want Baptismo aque, that is, the outward baptisme by water, yet, through the mercy of God, they are baptized Baptismo flaminis, that is, with the baptisme of the spirit of sanctification; and consequently with *Calvine* doe confesse that the children of the faithfull, dying before baptisme, are sanctified and saved. Notwithstanding all this, *Bellarmino* noteth *Calvine* for a *Pelagian Hereticke*, and tearmeth his owne Doctors *Catholickes*, which is a direct argument of a distorted and corrupt affection.

7. The second Accuser *Valentia* commeth nearer to the point, when (speaking of Protestants *Kemnitius*, *Melancthon*, *Calvine*, and all others) he saith: *Qui omnes, &c. Who all eury where, although they differ in word, yet they agree with a ioynt consent, affirming that originall sinne is an hereditary corruption and prauity of nature, which maketh vs. guilty of the eternall*

^d Reckon. p. 155

^e *Bellar. l. 1. de bap c. 4. §. quintum.*

Calvines iudgement iustified by Romanists.

^f See *Cassander* himselfe, de baptismo Infantum.

^g *Valent. lib. de pecc. orig. c. 7. in princip. vnto the end of the Chapter, & Tom. 2 de pecc. orig. disp. 6. q. 12. punct. 1. §. 4.*

eternall

ternall waſh of God, and is the fountaine of all wickedneſſe in men. Which manner of ſpeech may be applied to the iudgement of Illyricus, onely differing from him, in that he teacheth the hereditary corruption to be a forme ſubſtantiall, but theſe others do teach, that originall ſinne is conteyned onely in the defect of abſolute perfection and iuſtice, which ought to be in man. And much more to this effect, as to confeſſe that *Caluine* placed Originall ſinne principally in the Defect of perfect righteouſneſſe in our firſt conception, which defect is properly a ſinne; and the Sinner to be damned; which ſinne hee holdeth to be Remitted in baptiſme, not that it is not, but that it is not imputed. So that in the children of the faithfull Parents, in reſpect of their naturall originall, wherein there is a Defect of perfect righteouſneſſe, they are finfull and curſed; yet, through the covenant of Grace, they are the children of Adoption. If this be not ſufficient, our next witneſſe will make all cleare.

^b Pref. in libris
Vega.

ⁱ Vega. l. 2. de
Iuſtiſ. c. 6. § Et
probanit.
Proteſtants
iudgement
concerning
originall ſinne,
iuſtified by
their aduer-
ſaries.

8. *Vega*, a Doctor greatly commended by the Ieſuite ^b *Canisius*, and a principall Actor in the Councell of *Trent*, doth, in expounding the meaning of that Councell, yeeld vnto vs this his ingenuous and iudicious confeſſion; *The Proteſtants* (ſpeaking of all that hee had read, (and his reading of *Caluine* he ſheweth almoſt in euery Chapter) do teach in their Confeſſions, Apologies, and other bookes, the doctrine of originall ſinne, conſtantly and conſonantly with vs: but they, who were condemned at the Councell of *Trent*, were *Pelagians*, *Armenians*, *Albanenſes*, who denied originall ſinne. Doe you heare this, *M. Parſons*? *Caluine* and *Bucer* are accuſed by *Bellarmino* for diſſenting from your Church, by denying originall ſinne in the children of faithfull Parents. Heere your *Vega* telleth you, in effect, that it is a meere ſlaunder: for ſpeaking of *Proteſtants*, without exception, he ſaith that They do conſonantly agree with your Church in this queſtion of originall ſinne, and that even according to the meaning of the Councell of *Trent*. How then may your *Cardinall* bee thought to haue dealt honeſtly or conſcionably with *Caluine*? But they haue decreed to draw *Caluine* within the compaſſe of *Pelagianisme*: and to this purpoſe they proceed to another Queſtion.

Mr.

Mr. PARSONS *his Reckoning, concealing*
Veniall Sinnes.

WHereas Card. Bellarmine did charge Caluine and Caluinists with two principall errorrs of the Pelagians; the one, that which now hath been handled, Of denying Originall Sin in children and Infants of the faithfull; and the second, Of the denying of the difference of mortall and veniall sinnes, and holding that by euery least sinne we loose our iustice, and consequently that all sinne is mortall, Bellarmine cyting for the same the testimony of S. Hierome, who ascribeth that for Heresie vnto the Pelagians. And whereas in like manner he proueth the same heresie not onely to bee held by Luther and Melancthon, but also by Caluine in diuers partes of his workes, as L. 2. *Instit.* c. 3. §. 35. & L. 3. c. 4. §. 28. & c. M. Maron taking vpon him to cleare Caluine in the former charge about originall sinne, though so vn'luckily as you haue heard, saith neuer a word against this second, about the distinction of veniall and mortall sinnes, whereby it is euident in all probability, that he admitted that for true; and consequently yeelded secretly that Caluine doe agree with the Pelagians in this heresie, though he storme sharply against Bellarmine, as you haue heard, for charging Caluine with any point of Pelagianisme at all. And this fraude or frailtie he committeth commonly in all the rest of the Heresies objected, denying the one weakely, and by his silence granting the other, as now by experience you shall finde.

Reck. c. 3. §.
7. pag. 158.

Hierom. 2. l. cont.
Pelag.

The Reuerſe.

10. Which by experience your selfe shall finde to haue beene both vnſoberly and vn'luckily objected by your selfe: for in my last *Booke of Catholike Appeale*, both this and the rest of the Heresies objected by Bellarmine, haue bene proued to bee very slanderous. Concerning this particular, The summe of my aunſwere is this: First, *There appeareth no such words in Saint Hierome, nor doth Saint Augustine in his Catalogue of Heresies: nor yet the Romish Authors Castro, Prateolus, Lindane, or others, in their discussing of Heresies, obserue any such heresies in the Pelagians.*

* Catholique
Appeale. L. 5.
cap. 22. §. 3.

11. Secondly, sinnes are said to be Veniall in two respects, either in their owne nature, or else by Gods grace and indulgence. In nature all sinnes are mortall, albeit not all equal. By Gods mercy, (who doth not deale with his regenerate

Sinnes, how
veniall and
mortall.

¹ *Apud Valsquem*
Tom. 1. in 1. Tho.
² *disp. 42. c. 1.*
³ *n. 4. p. 939.*
^m *Cath. Appellate*
quo supra. §. 4.

ⁿ *Bellar. l. 1. de*
Amis. grat. c. 4.
^s *His errorib.*

according to his exact iustice) many kind of infirmities may be called *Veniall*. In which respect onely, your *Roffensis* is noted to have iudged of them accordingly, calling them *Veniall*, but not in their nature; but onely through the mercy of God, who doth not impune them vnto damnation. And what the impossibilitie of contrary doctrine is, hath beene likewise manifested at large. Neither doth *Gerson* or *Almain* accord vnto your common opinion, as *Bellarmino* himselfe doth confesse. The cause of *Caluine* standing thus vpright, the slaunder which is cast vpon him, will proue no *Veniall* sinne.

SECT. II.

The second slaunder vsed by Card. Bellarmine.

The Charge, concerning the Heresie of the Nouatians, in denying Penance.

^{*} *Preamb. p. 63.*

(4) *Nouatianorum, &c.*

Bellar. l. 4. de notis Eccl. c. 9. §. Nouatianorum.

(5) *Nouatianorum, &c.*

Castro. l. 12. Har.

3. Tit. Penitentia Vega li. 13.

de Iustis. c. 2. p. 486. Maldon. l. 5. c. 4.

(6) *Non Negant, &c.*

Bellar. l. 3. de Iustis. c. 6. & sepe alias.

(7) *Non de &c.*

Bellar. l. 1. de Penit. c. 8. §. ut igitur.

"12. * **B**ellarmino maketh Protestants guiltie of the Heresie of (4) *The Nouatians*, in taking from the Church all power of recöciling men vnto God, but by Baptisme, wherby he meaneth no Sacrament, but Baptisme. When as his own Authors note that (5) *The Heresie of the Nouatians* was this, viz. to denie any man, who should sinne after Baptisme, all hope of remission of finnes, although he should repent. Yea and also *Bellarmino* himselfe, in behalfe of Protestants, confesseth elsewhere, that (6) *They require repentance and faith in Christians, that they may be iustified and obtaine Remission of finnes.* Neither doth hee note any difference betweene vs and the Romanists, (7) *about repentance*, as it is a conversion vnto God with detestation of sinne, or as it consisteth in outward signes of sorrow, weeping, confession, and outward chastisements; yea and almost all of them allow an outward rite of absolution. But the only controversie between vs is, Whether Penance be properly a Sacrament. Heere I am called

called to a seuerer account, the briefe whereof followeth.

The summe of M^r PARSONS his Reckoning.

Here he will make a difference betweene Card. Bellarmine and other Authors about the Heresie of the *Novatians*: but all is full of fraud. His drift is to argue Bellarmine of falsitie, for affirming that Protestants of our dayes doe ioyne with the old Heretickes, the *Novatians*, in taking from the Church All power of reconciling men unto God, for these are Bellarmines words, and to contradict Bellarmine hee citeth the words of *Alphonfus de Castro*, saying that the heresie, &c. But these are not contrary: for the *Novatians* taught both points, principally that there was no power in the Church to reconcile them, who fell after baptism, especially into grievous finnes, as testifieth *Cyprian*, *Saint Ambrose*, and others; and this first part was against the keyes of the Church and power to remit finnes, and herein all Authors doe agree. But the second part of this error went further, as some doe gather out of the auncient Fathers, as testifieth *Suarez* (although others be of a contrary opinion) which was to denie furthermore, besides the Sacrament, all vertue of Penance whatsoever, whether priuate or Sacramentall. Bellarmine doth not ascribe vnto Protestants the deniall of priuate repentance, either inward, or outward, by sorrow and teares, but their deniall of Penance, as it is a Sacrament. And for *M. Morton* to inferre that forasmuch as *Alphonfus de Castro* saith, that the *Novatians* did denie all power of Penance, therefore Bellarmine said not truly, that they denied the Sacramentall vse thereof, is a most absurd manner of reasoning, called a *disparatis*, for both may be true, the one excludeth not the other.

*Reskon. cap. 3.
§. 8 pag. 160.*

The Reuerse.

13. If I shall giue you leaue to make my Reasonings, it is not vnlikely but I may haue them *absurd*: you must therefore suffer me to make mine own account, which I will bring into the true forme of reasoning thus:

Whosoever doth hold the heresie of the *Novatians*, in the deniall of remission of finnes, doth (according to the iudgement of *Alphonfus de Castro*) denie That there is any hope in any man, sinning after Baptisme, to obtaine remission of sinne, although he shall repent: But Protestants (as Card. Bellarmine contendeth) do not denie all hope of remission of finnes, committed after Baptisme, if sinners repent. Ergo, the Prote-

stants holde not the Doctrine of *Nouatians*.

14. Is not this conclusion established in the *Maior* by *Castro*, and in the *Minor*, by *Bellarmino*, which in the conclusion is fully contradictory vnto his former assertion, where he said, *Protestants hold the Heresie of the Nouatians*? Neither is the argument taken *à disparatis*, but *à contradicentibus*, and standeth thus: *Nouatians denie all hope of remission of sinnes committed after Baptisme*, and Protestants confesse some hope of remission of sinnes committed after Baptisme. This reasoning, I hope cannot be called *absurd*.

15. Neuerthelesse (passing ouer this *private Penance*, as it is a vertue which euery man must vse, for the obtaining of Remission of sinnes) let vs proceede vnto a second consideration of it, as it is a *power of reconciliation by vertue of the Keyes of the Church*. Concerning this, Protestants are confessed to admit a power of absolution in the Church, after Baptisme, and *Almost all of them* (saith *Bellarmino*) *doe allow an outward rite thereof*: for the reconciliation, in respect of notorious sinners, which the *Nouatians* did denie. But as for the forme of this *Reconciliation*, as whether it be a Sacrament, or no, it was neuer called into question, or censured to be the heresie of the *Nouatians*. Therefore *Bellarmino* by deuising a newe heresie, which he calleth *Nouatianisme*, that he might drawe Protestants into the guilt of an heresie, hath committed a grosse and inexcusable slander. And if *Mr. Parsons* shall answer this, I shall be contented to weare his badges, and termes of disgrace.

Bellarmino
slander.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Recko. quo supra.

Protestants are not accused by *Bellarmino*, for denying all Penance in generall, but for denying a Sacramentall Penance.

The Reueiwe.

16. If you had spoken in *Bellarmino*s Dialect, you would not haue said the *Deniall of Sacramentall Penance*, but the *Denying of Penance to be a Sacrament*. Now I shewed
of

of your owne Authours *Castro, Vega, Maldonate*, that they, in censuring the error of the *Nonatians*, did neuer note this to be the *Nonatians* heresie, viz. [The deniall of *Penance* to be a Sacrament. Neither could you, *M. Parsons*, proue this out of any one of them, albeit you haue giuen your diligence to finde it out. And this I take to be a sufficient conuiction: for although the denying of *All power of Penances* doth imply a deniall of *All Sacraments all power*, yet because the former was an heresie, it doth not follow that the latter must be also hereticall. For the *Sadducees* denying the Resurrection of mens bodies, which is an heresie of heresies, doe consequently denie, that in the Resurrection mens bodies shall haue their paradise vpon earth, which was the opinion of some: yet the denying of this is no heresie, nay it is an heresie not to denie it. After that *M. Parsons* had thus bemuddled the water, hee sought to catch an Eele, which is no sooner taken, but slippeth from him, because he, like one of the wise men of olde, tooke her by the taile. Shall we see how?

M. Parsons fraudulent dissembling.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

LET vs see briefly how many false trickes he vseth in this place: The first of all may be, that whereas Card *Bellarmino*, to proue that our moderne Protestants doe symbolize and agree with the olde *Nonatian* heresies, alleageth two particular Instances; first, in denying the power of the Church to remit sinnes, by the Sacrament of Penance: secondly, in denying the vse of holy Chrisme, in the Sacrament of confirmation: *M. Morton* hauing nothing to say to the second, replieth onely to the first by an Equiuocation, as you haue heard. And yet if the second onely be true, *Bellarmino* is iustified in noting Protestants of *Nonatianisme*; and therefore to denie the one, and dissemble the other must needs proceede of witting fraude, granting that which is chiefly in Controuersie; to wit, that Protestants doe holde in somewhat *Nonatianisme*.

Reckon. p. 163.

The Renewe.

18. That which in my Preamble was, for breuity sake, remitted to a further Treatise, no man of discretion would conclude to be therefore omitted *crasity*, as though it could

M. Parsons precipitate and rash in diuination.

not

* Ctholicke
Appeal. l. 4. c. 21
And to proue
that such like
Denials doe not
make an Here-
ticke, see the
Audienti in the
same booke.

not be iustly confuted. Yet such is the intemperate &, indeed, vnfortunate peremptorinesse of *M. Parsons*, for I haue^a else-where noted, that *Bellarmino*, euen in this second point, hath committed an iniury not onely against *Caluine*, but euen against the *Nonatians* themselues; where this, & the rest of the heresies, which are objected, are handled at large. Whereby the discreet Reader will perceiue, that there was as little fraud in my omission, as there is much folly in *Mr. Parsons* his Inference and Collection.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning, and charge of falsity.

Reckon. pag. 162,
163.

THe second fraud is, that when *Bellarmino* saith, that this was the principall error of the *Nonatians*, the word [*principall*] importing that they had other errors besides, is craftily cut off by *M. Morton*.

The Reniewe and discharge.

19. True it is that *Bellarmino* did note two errors in the *Nonatians*, the one was *principall*, and the other was of lesse importance; I, for breuity sake, proued Card. *Bellarmino* a Slaunderer in the *principall*, and *M. Parsons* is offended with me, that I haue spared his reputation in the lesse *principall*; and calleth it a point of *craftinesse* to omit the examination of that in a *Preamble*, which I haue discussed^b else-where in a full Treatise. So loose and lucklesse a man is *M. Parsons* continually in his imputation of *craft*.

M. Parsons his
childish & rash
objection of
craft.
^b Ctho. Appeale.
quo sup.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning, and charge of falsity.

Reckon. pag. 162.

VHere *Bellarmino* said, that *There is no power in the Church to reconcile men vnto God, but onely by baptisme*: These last wordes also, [*but onely by baptisme*] were by *Mr. Morton*, and by the same are shifted out of the Text, for that they haue relation to the Priests of the Church, to whom it appertaineth by publicke and ordinary office to baptize: and in this the Protestants are accused by *Bellarmino* to concurre with them in deniall of Penance, as it is a Sacrament.

The Reniew, and discharge.

20. *M. Parsons* his pallate is so distempered, that it turneth

neth every thing that it tasteth into *craft*, which vnto me seemeth to be an argument of his selfe-guiltinesse in points of craftinesse. I alleaged the sentence thus: *Nonatians denie all hope of remission of sinne after Baptisme*. This was sufficient for the acknowledgement of a power in *Baptisme* for remission of sinne. How could he call this a *Shifting*? hath he any reason for it? Yes he hath one, I pray you mark it (good Reader) for it is pretty: *The words were shufled out of the text* (saith he) *for that they haue relation vnto the Priests of the Church, to whom it appertayneth by publique and ordinary office to baptize*. He might as well haue said, that I did it in enuie vnto our owne Protestant Ministers, vnto whom I held *The publique office of baptizing to appertaine*. Such is the exceeding impotency of this professed Cauiller.

His fond and
falle conic-
ture.

MR. PARSONS his Reckoning, and
charge of falsity.

THirdly, he doth bring in guilefully the foresaid testimony of *Castro, Vega, and Maldonate*, as contrary to *Bellarmino*, whereas they speake of another thing, to wit, of Penance in another sense.

Reckon. p. 163.

The Reniew, and discharge.

21. *Castro, Vega, and Maldonate* did indeede speake of *Penance* and *Absolution* in another sense then *Bellarmino* did: for they neuer iudged it to be an *Heresie* of the *Nonatians*, to *Denie Penance to be a Sacrament*. Neyther was there euer any auncient Father or Romish Writer, whom *Maſt. Parsons* could produce, who so conceiued of the *Nonatian Heresie*, as *Bellarmino* hath done, who rather then Protestants should not be *Nonatian Heretickes*, hath feigned a new *Heresie*, which was neuer imputed to the *Nonatians*: which is, I must needs say, a *craft* and *fraude* intollerable.

His loose and
vniust repre-
hension.

22. The fourth traducement hath beene answered before, and the last is more childish then any of the rest, which is the alleaging of *Luther* truely in that sense, which I haue already iustified to be most true.

SECT. III.

The third charge against Bellarmine, for his Slander against Calvine, in the Question of Free-will.

* Pream. pa. 64.
(8) Manicheo-
rum, &c. Bellar.
l. 4. de notis Ec-
cles. c. 9. §. Ma-
nichæorum.
(9) Iohannes
Calvinus, &c.
Bellar. l. 1. de
Grat. primi ho-
minis. c. 1. §.
In eodem.

“ 22 * **T**HE (8) *Manichees* (said he) did condemn the nature of men, depriving them of Free-will, and ascribing the originall and beginning of sinne unto the nature of man, and not unto his Free-will: yet hath hee obserued that “ (9) *Calvine* teacheth, that man in his first creation had Free-will, whereby in his integrity he might, if he would, haue attained unto eternall life. This contradiction in this point is no more then this, to charge *Calvine* with that which he did not beleue. Is not this singular falshood? And yet behold a more notable then this.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning, and charge of folly.

*Reckon. ca. 3. §. 9.
pa. 167.*

WHerunto I answere, if it be more notable in folly then this, or else in fraude; it is notabler indeede. For to accuse a man to hold that which he holdeth not, is no contradiction, but a false accusation, nor alwayes falshood, for it might haue beene error. And this for the folly.

The Review.

23. Wisely, forsooth, *M. Parsons*; *Bellarmino* is supposed to haue written knowingly what was the opinion of the *Manichees* concerning *Free-will*, and as knowingly, to haue acknowledged the contrary opinion of *Calvine*: and yet notwithstanding did he ascribe vnto *Calvine* that opinion of the *Manichees*. Can this but imply a contradiction? But you say, this might haue beene by him not in *falshood*, but *upon error*: so any thing, wherein you haue charged mee with *falshood*, might haue proceeded onely from *error*. Is not this a rare point of wisdom, so to excuse and free *Bellarmino* from *falshood*, as that your owne Accusations of *falshood* shall be of no force? Where is the *Folly* now? But now to the *fraude*.

Mr.

*Bellarmines
Slander.*

M. PARSONS his Reckoning, and charge of fraude.

Calvine granting free will to haue beene in man before the fall, and lost after the first sinne of Adam, may concurre with the Manichees in this; that after the fall of Adam, as now we liue, we haue free-will, and so doth Card. Bellarm. take him, and proue out of his works, This then is an egregious fraude, and chiefly to delude in this place his Reader with ambiguity of different times. * The Manichees taught that man after Adams fall had no free-will, as both S. Hierome and S. Augustine doe testify in the sentence of M^r. Morton here set downe (though craftily he couered their names) and Bellarmine proueth Caluine to hold the same, out of his owne wordes and workes. What answereth M. Morton? Caluine (saith he) is confessed by Bellarmine to graunt free-will in man before the fall of Adam in his first creation. Yea but the question is after the fall.

Reckon. p. 167.

* Reckon. ibid.
pag. 168.

The Reuiewe, demonstrating the Slander.

24. What is this? Do those Fathers speake of Free-will after Adams fall? Eyther M. Parsons vnderstandeth not Bellarmine, or else Bellarmine vnderstood not those Fathers, for I am sure they spake of the Manichees denying free-will in mans first creation: First S. Augustine writing of this heresie of the Manichees, who taught that there were two first causes of mans nature: God, the Authour of the good part, and an euill Spirite Authour of the euill part of mans nature: and so *Pec-
catorum originem non libero arbitrio voluntatis sed substantia
tributus gentis aduersa: qua dogmatizantes esse hominibus mix-
tam, omnem carnem non Dei sed male mentis perhibent esse opi-
ficium &c.* That is: They ascribed the originall cause of sinne not vnto the free-will of man, but to the substance of an aduerse and contrary Nation, which they taught to be mixed in man, telling vs, that all flesh is not the workmanship of God, but of an euill Ghost. Heere is a manifest mention of the nature of man in his first workmanship, and an exposition of the error of the Manichees, ascribing the beginning of Euill, not vnto the free-will of the created nature, but vnto the eternall euill Creator, which was the Authour of that euill.

Two Fathers
notably abused
by M. Parsons
and Bellarm.c Aug. Tom 6. de
Heresi. c. 46.25. So likewise Saint Hierome in the place allcadged. ^d It
^d Hier. proem.
adu. Pelagian.

*Hier. in Isaiam

was (saith he) the Doctrine of the Manichees, to condemne the nature of man, to take away free-will, and also the helpe of God. What he futhermore meaneth by condemning the nature of man, wherein they acknowledge no free-will, he sheweth, where he condemneth the Manichees, for saying that *There was two created natures of man, one of the children of perdition, the other of the good ones. But if, as they say, the children of perdition were of most wicked nature, how is it said that that is found, which first was lost, how is the prodigall child said to haue bene lost, except first he had bene in some safe estate?* All this concerneth Free-will in the first creation. If you did not see this, Mr. Parsons, when you imputed *Fraud* vnto me, you haue erred: if you did see thus much, and yet would besprinkle me with note of *Fraude*, then you cannot auoid the shame of a calumniator vnder any pretence of error: but I must pardon you, for this is but a peece of your occupation. Which that it may be more euident, you proceede.

MR. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reckon. pag. 168.

ANother fraud, though somewhat lesse perhaps then the former, was, that in setting downe the charge of Bellarmine against *Caluine*, he recounteth the same as in Bellarmines own words, which are the words of S. Hierome and S. Augustine. And why, thinke you, did Mr. *Morton* conceale these two Fathers names? the causes are euident, first least the deniall of Free-will, defended by Protestants, should be pronounced Heresie by two so graue Fathers: the second for that it would haue marred his sleight of thinking that there was ment Free-will, in respect of the first nature of man.

The Renewe, confuting M. Parsons and his fellowes, by the confessed sentences of Fathers.

26. *Bellarmino* alleadging the former sentence out of the Fathers, to wit, *The Manichees condemned the nature of man, denying freedom of will*, did adde of his owne; which was the *Doctrine of Caluine*. The former I graunted for a truth, according to their proper sense: but *Bellarmino* his application of

of that heresie vnto *Caluine*, I cordernd (and that iustly) for a slander. All the Iniurie which I did, was not vnto *Bellarmino*, or vnto you, *M. Parsons*, but vnto my owne cause, to wit, even because I did not alledge the sentence in the names of those *Fathers*, whereby the lauishnesse of the slander might haue beene made more manifest, as from the Testimonies of those *Fathers* hath beene already proued.

27. And for a more perfect conuiction both of Mr. *Parsons*, and his Client, it will not be impertinent to set downe the confession of their owne Iesuite *Maldonate*, & *Many Fathers* (saith he) *by the substance, which the Prodigall child lost* (Luc. 15.) *did vnderstand Free-will, as Saint Augustine, Bede* (he might haue added Saint & *Hierome*) *Euthimius*, and Saint *Bernard*. So *Maldonate*, who disliking these speeches, faineth an exposition of his owne: but the sentences of these *Fathers* doe grant a losse of *Freewill*, by *Adams* fall. And how ordinarie is that sentence of Saint *Augustine*: *Man, by abusing his Free-will, lost both it, and himselfe?* yea and the *Schoolmen* thought (saith *Erasmus*) that Saint *Augustine* in some places yielded too little vnto mans *Free-will*. Now let any iudge whether of vs two is the man of *Fraude*. But I must not escape thus.

† *Maldon. Ies. Comment. in Luc. 15. ver. 13.*
‡ See aboue.

The fathers iudgement concerning free-will.

h *Epist. dedicat. ante libros Hieronymi.*

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning, and fourth charge of Fraude.

VV Hereas Card. *Bellarmino* doth alleadge two points, wherein the Protestants of our time, but especially *Caluine*, do concur with the Manichean Heresie; the one, that which hath bene sayd of the denying of *Free-will*, the other in reprehending and condemning *Abraham*, *Samson*, *Sara*, *Rebecca*, &c. and other Saints of the old Testament, as Saint *Augustine* testifieth, that the *Manicheans* did; and *Bellarmino* sheweth that *Caluine* doth hold the very same, prooued by multiplicity of places quoted out of his workes: Mr. *Morton* passeth ouer with silence this latter proof as vnanswerable, yet will haue vs thinke that *Bellarmino* did iniure *Caluine*, in noting him with the *Manichean* Heresie: which is as much as if a man hauing two writings to shew for a suit in Law, the Attorney of the Aduerser parte should suppress the one, which is most plaine and euident, and caull about the other,

Reck. pag. 169.

The Reuerſe.

His heady taxation.

¹ Cath. Ap-
peale, § c. 19.

² Calvin In-
fruct aduers.
Libert. c. 3.
¹ Pererius Jef.
in Gen. 11. l. 16.
Disp. 17. n. 255,
&c.

28. This is pretty (Mr. Parsons) but yet I must needs say, it is both witlesse and lucklesse : for bee it knowne vnto you that I could not thinke that second obiection of *Bellarmino vn-
answerable*, which I haue already ¹ answered, and prooued to be as wicked a slander as any of the rest : I may not denie your Palat a tast of that answer.

29. First I prooued out of your owne Doctors, that the Heresie of the *Manichees*, was not the noting of the Idolatry of *Abraham, &c.* Secondly, that to say with *Caluine*, that *Abraham had once bene an Idolater*, is no Heresie, but a truth, and by your Iesuite ¹ *Pererius* confessed to haue bene iustified by many Romish Doctors, & other Authors, such as *Genebrard, Masius*, yea and by *Iewish Rabbins*, and *Rhilo* : afterward by *Lindane* out of *Suidas* and Saint *Augustine*. To which of all these dare you (who are so bold with *Caluine*) ascribe the note of the forenamed heresie of the *Manichees*? Therefore it cannot be, but that this your *Holy itch*, (as you haue named it) doth proceede from a malignant humour.

S E C T. IIII.

The fourth slander used by Bellarmine.

The charge.

30. * **H**EE accused *Bullinger* of (10) *Arianisme*, because of this sentence, [*Tres sunt non statim, sed gradu, &c.* "Notwithstanding he knew that this was the very sentence of *Tertullian*. And is therefore else-where expounded as "orthodoxall and iustificable by (12) himselfe.

* *Pream. pa. 64.*
(10) *Henr. Bullingerum, &c.*
Bellar. pres. in contr. de Christo.
S. Henrici, & Greg. Valent. Ief. lib. de unit. & Trinit. c. 9. (12) *Tertullianus &c. Bellar. l. 1. de Christo. c. 10 §. Respondeo 2.*

M. Par-

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning, and charge of abuse.

MAfter *Morton* doth offer him (that is, *Bellarmino*) great abuse, for he neuer alloweth any where of the whole sentence, as it standeth in the Booke against *Praxea*, but onely of the first two words, *Non statim, sed gradu*; saying; that *per gradum*; he vnderstandeth *ordinem personarum*. Recko. pag. 172.

The Review.

31. The Antitrinitarian Heretickes objected, for prooofe of their error, the whole sentence of *Tertullian*, which is this; *Tres sunt non statim, sed gradu; non substantia, sed forma; non potestate, sed specie differentes*. And now Mr. *Parsons* telleth vs, that *Bellarmino* cutting off the latter part of the sentence, answered onely the first two words, *Non statim, sed gradu*: so that when Mr. *Parsons* would free *Bellarmino* from a slander, he doth in effect accuse him of singular fraud, in cutting off the chiefe part of the sentence of *Tertullian*, as though it had beene vnanswerable, and so (as much as that testimonie of *Tertullian* could worke) betrayed the Catholick cause vnto the *Arians*. Whensoever I happened to cut off any sentence, although altogether impertinent, Mr. *Parsons* pursueth me as vehemently, as he would doe a man that had cut a purse: here hath he taken his Lord Cardinall *Bellarmino* cutting off that part of the Sentence, which did most principally concerne the cause, and yet doth he professe himselfe an Advocate in his behalfe. Surely, this prooueth that Mr. *Parsons* was nothing lesse then *Sober* (for spitefulnesse is a kind of drunkennesse) when he made this Reckoning, who, that hee might charge me with abusing of *Bellarmino*, hath himselfe so farre abused *Bellarmino*, as to make him a fraudulent Abuser of *Tertullian*.

M. Parsons maketh *Bellarmino* to betray the Catholique cause.

Master PARSONS his Reckoning, and second charge of Fraude.

MAfter *Morton* bringeth in *Valentia* in his Margent, approving, or at least-wise, not improving the same sentence of *Tertullian* thus: *Sic scribit* Reckon. p 171.

scribit Tertul. Tres sunt non statu sed gradu, non substantiâ sed formâ, non potestate sed specie. This is a Fraud, for *Tertullian* is not so much as named by him in the place alleadged, but *Bullinger* is reprehended for vsing the same sentence, *Tres sunt, &c.* Which *Mr. Morton* would haue his Reader thinke he had allowed.

The Renewe, and discharge.

M. Parsons
lauiſh wrangling.
m As is plaine
in the first part
of my Apolog.
Cath. pag. 149.
whence the
sentence was
transcribed.
n See in the
beginning of
Tertul. Bafil. An.
1521. Admonitio
ad Lectorem, de
quibusdam Ter-
tulliani dogmatib.

32. Here is onely a *Marginall note*, not insisted vpon in the Text, so much as by name, nor any inference to bee iustly made out of it, but intimating onely that *Valentia* knew that this was the *Sentence of Tertullian*, which probably he did: So that in this there is no occasion or iust suspicion of fraude: And now the onely error was the m misplacing of a marginal quotatiô. For the sentence, which I alleadged was thus *Verbatim* set down in the Author of the Preface vnto *Tertullian: Sic scribit Tertullianus aduersus Praxeam, Tres sunt non statu sed gradu; non substantiâ, sed formâ; non potestate, sed specie differentes.* Which being obserued, may acquit me not onely of fraude, but euen of any fault, except that which will happen sometime to the most vigilant Writers. Let vs returne to *Bellarmino*.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reck. p. 173.

Bellarmino expounded the first wordes of *Tertullian*, saying *Per gradum intelligit ordinem personarum: Tertullian* in this place by Degree vnderstood onely the order of persons, and not a different degree of perfection: But the whole sentence of *Tertullian* he neuer defended nor admitted, but held it rather for erroneous in *Tertullian*, and hereticall in *Bullinger*: And now, you see what notable aduantage *M. Morton* hath gotten out of this his so notable obiection.

The Renewe.

33. If I had gotten *no aduantage* before, yet now haue I gained much by this Reckoning: the first is this, that *Bellarmino*, whom I was to proue a falsificator, may be conuicted of falshood by your confession, for to cut off a necessary part of a sentence of *Tertullian*, where the whole was objected, doth argue fraude in the highest degree. Secondly I finde in your
Answer,

Answer, that which may be obserued in many of your fellowes, that Protestants are condemned by you for *Heretikes* sometimes, when they speake the very language of auncient Fathers. Thirdly I discerne in you, Mr. Parsons, cyther ignorance not to vnderstand, or malice not to acknowledge the truth of this doctrine of *Tertullian*, which hath beene thus cleared by the *Author of the Admonition, concerning the opinions of Tertullian*, præfixed before his workes, expounding the fore-named sentence, *Tres sunt, &c.* thus; *Tertullian* (saith he) calleth that a *State*, which the Schoolemen cal the *substance*: that he calleth a *Degree*, which they cal *Notion*: that he nameth a *form*, which they terme *properties*: & he taketh that to be *Species*, or *kinde*, which they note to be the *maner of being*. Will not now M. Parsons blush to perceiue his malady detected, whil'st that he chole that *Tertullian* should bee rather condemned, then that (as I may so say) his sonne *Bullinger* a Protestant should not be condemned? Here is malice.

Three observable points.

M. Parsons ignorance of the iudgement of *Tertullian*.

S E C T. V.

The first slander vsed by Bellarmine.

“ 34. **B**ellarmine said of Protestants (said I) that
 “ (13) They teach that the soules of faithfull men
 “ departing this life, doe not goe directly vnto heauen. In ano-
 “ ther place he together with his fellowe Iesuite, hath pub-
 “ lickly recorded that it is a common (14) Obiection of Pro-
 “ testants, prouing from Scriptures, against the doctrine of Par-
 “ gatory, that the soules of the faithfull presently after death, go
 “ directly vnto heauen. Hereunto Master Parsons doth aun-
 swere.

Octaua ob. & Gregor. de Valent. de Purg. c. 3. & Rhemists Annot in Apoc.

* Preamb. p. 65.

(13) Secundum errorem, &c. Bellar. l. 1. de be- at. Sanct. c. 4. Paulô post iri- tium.

(14) Octaua obiection, &c. Bellar. l. 1. de I- mag. c. 3 §. 14. 13.

M^r. PARSONS his Reckoning.

I Haue consulted with Bellarmine, at leastwise with his booke, and hee answereth that the word, Protestants, twise heere repeated, is not found in him in the place by you cyted: for that hee ascribeth nor

Recken. pag. 164. 165.

this

this heresie vnto all Protestants in generall, but onely vnto three in particular of our time, viz. *Luther, Cornelius Agrippa, and John Caluine*. So as *M. Morton* hath made him to taxe all Protestants, and to say, *They doe teach, &c.* Whereas he taxeth only three particular men. Neyther haue I yet read any other that defendeth the same.

The Reuiewe.

35 Neyther did I say that *Bellarmino* did accuse *All Protestants*, as you inferre, but onely *Protestants*, as you confesse. In whom then is the fraude? But you say he noted *Caluine* and *Luther by name*. As though in them hee did not often condemne Protestants in generall, although not in vniuersall. And because you say you haue consulted with *Bellarmino*, or with his booke; I must tell you, that either your outward or inward sight hath deceiued you, for if you shall, for your better information, consult againe with the 4. cap. of the same booke, §. *Primus*, you shall finde these wordes: *At secundum errorem Calvinistarum non ad Deum ibant* (namely, the Martyrs,) *sed ad inferos, aut ad alium locum extra caelum*. That is, *According to the error of the Calvinists, the Martyrs went not vnto God, but vnto some other place without heauen*. Doe you not see that *Caluinists* are here generally charged with this error? And in the margent I said *Caluinists*. After that you haue examined this, it may be you will confesse that by your former Consultation you made no *Sober Reckoning*.

36. Furthermore, I neuer read (say you) of any other, but the aboue-named *Luther, Agrippa* (who was no^a Protestant) and *Caluine* that defended the same: and yet your *Bellarmino* hath not feared to charge not onely *Caluine*, but also *Caluinists*, for defending this doctrine. Dooft thou not see (good Reader) what an vnhappy Proctor *M. Parsons* is become in *Bellarmino* behalfe, who will seeme to haue consulted in this point with Card. *Bellarmino*, and yet yeeldeth no better satisfaction, then that which may bee a confutation both of him and of his booke? If the Card. should know this, it may be *M. Parsons* should heare that *non eris ultra villicus*: and be presently put out of this office of Reckoning. Let vs come neerer vnto *Bellarmino* his accusation of *Caluine*. Maft.

M. Parsons is ignorant of *Bellarmino*s booke, with which he saith, he consulted.

^a See his booke *De vanit Scient.* cap. 6. v. *sus finem*, where he calleth the

Protestants Hereticks. And as some note,

was commended by Pope

Leo the tenth,

l. 1. Ep. 38. See the booke of

Pope *Ioan*,

pag. 104.

M. Parsons his answer en-

angleth *Bellarmino* in an

higher suspition of slander.

^a *Luc.* 16. 2.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Caluine chiefly maintained this errour, saying that the Saints doe expect without in a certain Porch or Entry, vntill the consummation of the world: From whence Bellarmine inferreth that, The Saints by Caluines doctrine, are shut out of Heauen. *Reckon. pag. 175.*

The Reniew, discovering the manifolde fraudes used by Bellarmine, and the integrity of Caluine in this Article of entrance into Heauen.

37. This I say and auerre to be an vngodly and vnconscionable slander, and so may you know, if you will haue the patience but to heare eyther the accused, or the accuser speak: first Caluine, who is the party accused, deliuereth vnto vs, as part of his Creed, saying, *Credimus quod, &c. v We beleene that which Paul speakes, viz. When our earthly house is destroyed, we shall haue a permanent house In Heauen; therefore doe we desire to sit out of this life, that we may be with the Lord, and enjoy all good things. For if the soules of the faithfull, as soone as they are out of this body, doe liue with God, and enjoy the happinesse of that Kingdome, yet the perfect felicity (whereby Caluin meaneth that which is the consummation of blessednes both in body and soule, which cannot be vntill the generall Resurrection) God hath referred vntill the second comming of Christ.* What better Comment would any require of one Article of faith, concerning the direct passage of soules into the reall Kingdome of God in heauen? Thus much the accused partie for himselfe.

Caluin. aduers. Libertin. s. 22.

38. But what if Bellarmine, who is his Accuser, shall also free him from excluding the soules of Saints out of Heauen? *Si quis petat, &c. If any (saith Bellarmine) doe aske Caluine where the soules of the iust were, before the comming of Christ? he answereth that they were in Heauen, although they saw not God, nor shal see him til the day of iudgment. By which Bellarm might know he meant the perfect sight of God both in soule and body (as he himselfe expoundeth Irenaus, Lib. 1. de beat.*

Bellar. l. 4. de Christo c. 9 s. Si quis.

a Caluine upon
the text of the
penitent thiefe.

c. 4. §. *Quod ergo*) *until the day of iudgement.* Here is a plaine confession, that *Caluine* taught a locall presence of the soules of the faithfull, who, before Christs comming, entred into *Heaven*: And would he then exclude the faithfull of the new Testament from the same hope? No; for *Caluine* himselfe reasoneth thus: *Quod si Latroni, &c.* a *If the theefe upon the Crosse, had entrance into heauen, much more will Christ, now, after he hath conquered death, put out his hande out of his Throne to apprehend vs, & to gather vs into the fellowship of life, seeing he receiued the thiefe into his bosome, and did not abandon him into a purgatory.* Who seeth not now the wilfull *Slaunder*, which *Bellarmino* hath committed against *Caluine*?

39. Furthermore that his malice heerein may better appeare, we shall finde that first he depraueth the sentences of *Caluine* notoriously, by wrestling his obscure sentences, rather then by acknowledging his most plaine conclusions.

• Infit. l. 3. c. 20.
§. 20.

40. Secondly, by perverting the testimony alleaged out of *Caluine*: for whereas *Caluine* said: • *Christus solus ingressus est Sanctuarium.* *Christ onely entred into the Sanctuary of heauen;* distinguishing the *Sanctuary* of heauen from the *Atrium*; *Bellarmino* maketh his conclusion to haue beene, *Christum solum esse in calo,* that is, *Christ onely to be in heauen,* as though there were not in heauen (as Christ speaketh) *many Mansions*; and that he, who is not in the chiefe place of heauen, were therefore excluded out of heauen. This is another falshood.

† Bellar. l. 1. de
Eccles. Triumph.
c. 1. §. Eundem
habet.

Bellarmino de-
praueth the
sentence of
Caluine.

† Infit. quo
supra.

41. Thirdly *Caluine* speaketh of a porch of *Heaven*, by allusion vnto the people of the olde lawe (who stood in the Porch, whilst only the high Priest went into the *Sanctuary* to offer for the people) and saith, that for *Christ* our high Priest is onely entred into the *Sanctuary* of *Heaven*, that he may offer up the vowes of the people, which stand in the Porch a farre off; meaning the people of the militant Church in this life, of whom he said, *Sic membrorum omnium adhuc in terra laborantium vnus Mediator Christus.* That is, *Christ is the onely Mediator for his members, which trauell in this earth.* And now to change the *Atrium* of Saints in this world, into the *Atrium* of Saints in glorie, is to turn earth into heauen, which is another iniury.

42. Lastly,

42. Lastly, if we shall suppose that *Caluine* by *Atrium*, had meant the place of soules departed, and had said that the soules departed could not enter into the *Sanctuary*, yet *Bellarmino* knowing other plaine and iustificable sentences of *Caluine*, might have afforded his obscure places as fauourable an exposition, as he allowed *S. Bernard*, who taught an *Atrium* also, to wit, ^h *Dicit quidem Bernardus, &c. Bernard indeed saith, that the Saints shal not see God before the resurrection, and untill then to remaine in Atrio, That is, in the Porch: Whereby he meant not (saith Bellarmine) to denie the simple vision of God, but that perfect vision which shall be both in body and soule after the resurrection.* Here againe wee may discerne a malignancie in our Romish Writers, who when they finde *Fathers* and *Protestants* agreeing in the same tearmes (as before was obserued in the testimony of *Tertullian*) yet do they iustifie the sayings of the *Fathers* as holy truths, and reiect the sentences of *Protestants* as damnable heresies.

^h Bellar. l. i. de
beat. sanct. c. 5.
§. Ad 2a.

The same slander fastened by Bellarm. upon Luther.

I Haue consulted with *Bellarmino*, at least with his booke, and he ascribeth this heresie vnto *Caluine* and *Luther*; &c.

Reckon. quo
supra p. 174.

The Renewe.

43. He doth so indeed: ¹ *Luther* (saith *Bellarmino*) held the same error in his *Lectures* upon *Genesis*, as *Fredericus Staphylus* doth cye him. Who accuseth *Luther*? *Bellarmino*, a professed Reader against him: but by what witness? euen by *Staphylus*, a Romanist, and a professed Rayler against *Luther*: Lastly, from what place? From his *Lectures* upon *Gen.* where I can finde nothing for defence of that errour, but much for the confutation thereof. For *Prælet.* in *Gen. cap. 25.* where (after that hee had affirmed, that the soules of the iust after death, doe not go eyther into *Hell*, or into *Purgatorie*, but into peace) he saith *Iustos omnes, &c.* That is: *That all the iust, when they depart out of this life, doe goe to Christ, and are receined into his bosome, euen into Paradise; which Paradise he*

¹ Bellar. l. i. de
Ecclesiast.
ump. c. 1. §.
Secundum erro-
rem.

there calleth *Heaven*. Therefore the former accusation doubtlesse, came not from heauen.

* See hereafter, l. i. c. 12. §. 13.

M. Parsons
partiality:

44. It may please the Reader to observe, that whereas I * happened to produce the testimony of *Tolosanus*, a Romish Authour, cyting *Frisingenfis* against the violent and turbulent practizes of later Popes, *M. Parsons* held it to be a fraudulent iniury to alleage the Relater *Tolosanus*, and not *Frisingenfis*, who was the Authour himselfe. But now *M. Parsons* in this place, seeth *Bellarmino* cyting *Staphylus*, the professed enemy of *Luther*, by whose testimony *Luther* is noted of *Heresie*, and yet he thinketh that *Bellarmino* hath done honestly. Here is good Reckoning.

The sixth slander used by Cardinall Bellarmine against Caluine.

* Preamb. p. 65.
(15) *Bellarmino* l. 4.
de notis Eccles.
c. 9. ad finem.
(16) *Quæ* sententia. &c. *Bellarmino* l. 1. de Euch.
c. 1. initio.
(17) Docet *Caluinus* &c.
Bellarmino ibid §.
Secundò docet
(18) Docet *Caluinus*, &c.
Valent. Ies. Tom.
4. disp. 6. q. 3.
p. 1. §. Item.

* 45. *Bellarmino* challengeth (15) *Caluine* for (as he calleth it) an auncient *Heresie* alleaged by *Theodoret*, affirming that there is onely a figure of *Christ's* body in the *Eucharist*. And yet in another place affirming, both (16) That that opinion is not auncient, nor yet now to be found in *Theodoret*; and also that (17) The foresaid doctrine of *Caluine* doth teach, that in the *Eucharist* there is to be exhibited vnto the faithfull, not onely a figure of *Christ's* body, but also the body and blood it selfe, by which meat soules are nourished vnto eternall life. Or, as another Iesuite testifieth for *Caluine*, (18) That our soules communicate with the body of *Christ* substantially. Here is no more oddes in this Accusation, then ancient and not auncient; heresie and not heresie.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

* *Reck. cap* 3. §. 12. pag. 181.

THE objected contradiction in this place is, that *Bellarmino* confesseth *Caluine* to hold, that together with the Sacrament of the *Eucharist*, God doth exhibite vnto the faithfull not onely a signe of *Christ's* body, but also the body and blood it selfe, yea and as *Valexia* addeth further, that *Caluine* confesseth that our soules doe communicate with the body of *Christ* substantially. Whereunto I answere, true it is, that in wordes *Caluine* doth affirme as much in some parts of his

his workes, but denyeth it againe in others, and thereupon doe both *Bellarmino* and *Valentia* conuince him of most euident and palpable contradictions in this matter. Which prooueth no contradiction in *Bellarmino*, but in *Caluine* himselfe.

The Renewe.

45. So doe you pursue many testimonies of *Caluine* to no purpose, for there is a reall eating of Christs body spiritually, and not onely bodily: all the question is, whether in the Sacrament we receiue onely a *Signe* of Christ, and not the very body it selfe: So said those auncient Heretickes, and so *Caluine* is traduced by *Bellarmino* to haue affirmed. This matter would bee better examined. A Syllogisme would set all straight.

Maior. No man admitting more then a *signe* of Christs body to be receiued in the *Eucharist*, doth concurre with the auncient *Heretickes*, mentioned by *Theodoret*, who defended receiuing only of the *signe* of Christs body:

Minor. But *Caluine*, by the confession of *Bellarmino* and others, taught, that we receiue in the *Eucharist* more then a *signe* of Christ his bodie:

Ergo, *Caluine* taught not that auncient *Heresie* mentioned by *Theodoret*.

47. The *Maior* will not be denied: the *Minor* is this, that *Caluine* taught that we receiue more then a *signe*, euen a *Seale* also, as *M^r. Parsons* noteth; by vertue whereof *Caluine* saith, that we receiue the very body and blood of Christ, as *Bellarmino* himselfe confesseth: not onely Sacramentally, but (as *Valentia* witnesseth) *Substantially communicating in our soule with the body of Christ*. So that in the conclusion (which is contradictory vnto *Bellarmino* his assertion) wee see in *Bellarmino* a manifest contradiction. Neyther shall Master *Parsons* with all the arte hee hath, auoyde this, vntill he can shew some place in *Caluine*, wherein it is said, that we receiue onely a *signe* of Christs body in the *Eucharist*, and not his bodie: which neyther he, nor any of his Disciples shall euer be able to performe.

*Reckp. 182.
la. ult.*

48. A second contradiction is as plaine, wherein, as hee would charge *Caluine* with an *Auncient Heresie mentioned by Theodoret*, and yet saith, *Nè glorientur Calvinisti suam sententiam esse valde antiquam*, That is, *Least the Calvinists might boast that their opiniō is very auncient* (towit, as were the daies of *Theodoret*,) &c: so doth he hereby confesse that it was not so auncient. But so auncient, and not so auncient, make a contradiction. And yet whilst I doe accuse others, I am called to a *coram* my selfe.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning, and charge of fraude.

Reckon. p. 177.

M^r. *Morton* hath commonly alleaged no instance of fraude in his aduersary, but with some fraude in himselfe, and none perhaps with more, then in this sixth and last obiection in that kinde, concerning the testimony of *Theodoret* for reall presence, for that heere be so many foule fautes and wilfull corruptions, as truly if after so many admonishments I should vse the same, it would make me ashamed to looke any man in the face.

The Review.

49. I am right glad to heare that *M. Parsons* hath a face, which can possibly be *ashamed*. For I shall put his face to the tryall, euen in these his objected falsities. What is the first?

Master PARSONS his Reckoning.

Recke. pag. 179.

HE mentioneth *Caluine* to be challenged by *Bellarmino* for his heresie, leauing out *Zuinglius*, who is equally challenged with *Caluine*. This is one tricke.

The Review.

M. Parsons silly wrangling.

¹ *Bellarmino* J. A. de notis Eccles. 9.
 & L. de Eucharist. c. 1. §. edidit.
 &c.

50. When *Card. Bellarmine*, in slaundering two parties, did contradict himselfe in his Accusation of one, was it not sufficient to proue, that he had wilfully transgressed his conscience from the apparant contradiction in that one, except it were prooued that he did contrary himselfe in his accusing of them both? Would any *Sober* braine note this for a *Tricke of fraude*? Neuertheless seeing that the doctrine of *Caluine* and *Zuinglius*

Zuinglius were (according to Bellarmine his opinion) in this point both one, will M. Parsons denie that in Caluine, Zuinglius is absolved?

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning

Then he omitteth wholly the mention of the seventh generall Councell, which so long agoe confuted the same heresie. And this is another tricke. Reckon. p. 179.

The Review.

51. It did indeed confute that olde Heresie, whereof Caluine (by the iudgement of Bellarmine) was not guilty: and therefore this is a point of your owne idle trickishnesse, to put this Councell into your Reckoning. What yet more? His fond impertinency.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Furthermore he concealeth in like manner the name and authority of olde S. Ignatius, who in his time (which was immediately after the Apostles) held the denying of the Reall presence to bee an heresie: and this is a third tricke. Reckon. ibid.

The Review.

52. Bellarmine himselfe hath^m said, that the contention in the dayes of Ignatius, concerned rather the incarnation of Christ, then the Sacrament of the Eucharist. And yet hath M. Parsons the power to face out the matter, as though the omission of the name of Ignatius were a fraudulent Trick. Know furthermore that the Heretickes spoken of, held that Christ had not a naturall, but a phantasticall bodie; and that therefore in the Eucharist his body could not be exhibited in a figure, but onely a phantasticall body: and so made the Eucharist, a figure of a figure. ^m Bellar. l. 1. de Eucharist. c. 1.
M. Parsons Ignorance of the objected heresie.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Whereas Card. Bellarmine saith, Quia sententia, &c. Which sentence is cyted by Theodoret in his Dialogue out of the Epistle of Ignatius ad Smyrneneses where now it is not to bee found, Reckon. ibid.

meaning that it is not found in the Epistle of *Ignatius*, *M. Morton* saith that it is not found in *Theodore*; and vpon this falsity of his owne, will needes frame a contradiction in *Bellarmino*.

The Reuerie.

53. From these wordes [*Where now it is not to be found in Theodore*] I did not draw any note of contradiction against *Bellarmino*, this is *Mr. Parsons* his wilfull vntruth, as the Reader will iudge. But yet say, I pray you, (*Mr. Parsons*) if I had so censured *Bellarmino*, whether had it beene a greater fault in him, to haue abused the *Dialogue of Theodore*, or *Epistle of Ignatius*?

His wilfull vntruth.

M. Parsons aime is eyther falsc or friuolous.

54. I know you will be muttering within your selfe, saying thus: If I shall aunswere, that the corruption of *Theodore* is worse, then will *T. M.* note me of grosse ignorance, because *Ignatius* was *S. Johns Scholler*, and therefore farre more auncient and worthy then *Theodore*. But if I say that it had beene a greater offence to corrupt *Ignatius*, then will *T. M.* reply, that I shew my selfe malicious in condemning him of wilfull falshood, for charging *Bellarmino* with a lesse offence, (that is, the corrupting of *Theodore*) when as he might rather haue challenged *Bellarmino* for a greater fault, euen the abusing of the *Epistle of Ignatius*. The last Accusation was false, this is friuolous, both malicious. When will he end this part of his Reckoning?

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reckon. pag. 183.

BEfore I enter into this other Examen, there occurreth vnto mee a consideration worthy to be pondered by the Reader, which is, that all these fixe obiections made against *Card. Bellarmino* for imputing olde heresies vnto Protestants, are taken out of his fourth book of the notes of the Church, cap. 9. where he chargeth the Protestants of his time with twenty seuerall condemned olde heresies, yet *M. Morton* thought good to set vpon fixe: Which *M. Morton* picking out onely a few, and leauing all the rest as not excusable, and vnderhand by his silence graunteth that they are held by Protestants, Which how markeable a point it is, I leaue to the Reader to iudge.

The

The Review.

55. Good Reader, know that Mr. *Parsons* hath required thy iudgement, in a matter which he holdeth *worthy consideration*, and *ponderous*. His consequence is this: *M. Morton* hath chosen onely sixe *Objections of Heresie* (which he calleth *Slaunders*) of twenty: Ergo, by his silence he doth in effect acknowledge the rest fourteene Heresies, to haue beene iustly obiected against Protestants. Now I also desire thy further *consideration*, to iudge, whether this Reckoning of his be eyther sensible or conscionable.

Mr. Parsons vnreasonable exaction.

56. For first, the Treatise was onely a *Preamble* vnto a Treatise, and as it were the foote to the bodie of this booke, yet doth M. *Parsons* exact, that I should haue either set down all the rest of the slaunderous accusations, which *Bellarmino* hath vsed against *Protestants*, or else to confesse them to be no slaunders. But hath not the Apostle demanded from reason, that if " *All the body were an eye*, then *where should be the hearing*? So say I, if all had beene a *Preamble*, to what end had beene an offer of a large *Encounter*? Would any thinke Mr. *Parsons* to be in his *sober* wits, if when he seeth the picture of his Fathers face onely, he should thereby conclude that his Father was all face, and no bodie? And yet doth hee quarrell with me for not setting downe all things in the *Preamble*, and as it were the Preface of this *Encounter*.

" 1. Cor. 12. 17.

57. Secondly, it is also an vnconscionable, or at least an inconsiderat *Consideration*, which Master *Parsons* vrgeth: For euen all those other *Fourteene*, and diuers moe heresies, obiected by *Bellarmino*, against the *Protestants*, haue beene by me particularly examined, discusied, and prooued to haue beene so many inexcusable slaunders, euen in that Booke of " *Apologie*, whereof Master *Parsons* himselfe hath taken particular notice: but more fully and exactly in my last *Catholicke Appeale*, the fift Booke whereof is spent in the confutation of these and other slaunders, which our Romish Aduersaries haue falsly obiected against *Caluine*, and other Protestants. Thus we see that his *Ponderous Consideration*,

" *Apolog. Cathol. part. 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6.*

being put into the ballance, is found to weigh no more then doth a vaine and fantasticall conceit.


CHAP. IX.

Concerning three other corrupted Allegations of Cardinall Bellarmine.

SECT. I.

The charge concerning Saint Cyprian in the poynt of Tradition.

* Preamb. p. 66.

" I. "  Aint Cyprian stood vpon written Tradition :
" Bellarmine said that he did it in defending an
" error, Therefore no mannaile (saith he) though
" Cyprian erred in so reasonnig ; for the which
" cause Saint Augustine doth worthily refuse him. In which
" place S. Augustine seemeth to bee so farre from confuting
" him, for reasoning so, that he saith : That which Cyprian
" warneth vs, to runne vnto the fountaine, that is vnto the Tra-
" ditions of the Apostles, from thence to deriue a Conduict to
" our times, that is chiefly and doubtlesse to be performed.

The summe of M^r. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Recko. c. 3. § 13.
pa. 187.

THIS was no good forme of arguing in him, but in this necessitie, for defending this error : for first Saint Augustine doth of purpose refuse the same, and Saint Cyprian doth elsewhere yeeld and allow the vnwritten Traditions : I graunt that S. cyprian saith (as Saint Augustine also doth) that when any Tradition or Doctrine can bee clearly shewed out of Scripture, *Optimum est*, It is questionlesse the best way of all : But when there is no Seripture for prooffe of it, then (saith S. Augustine) *Consuetudo illa*, &c. that is, The custome which was opposed against Cyprian, must be beleeued to haue proceeded from the Apostles, as many things else, which the Vniuersall Church doth hold, and

and therefore are well beleueed to haue bene commaunded by the Apostles, albeit they are not found written.

The Renewe.

2. What Saint *Augustines* iudgement, was concerning the sufficiencie of Scripture, as it is defended by the Protestants, he hath often vnfolded, saying that ^a Amongst all things which are contained plainly in Scripture, all those things may be found, which concerne faith and manners of life. And againe, ^b Whensoever there is a case of greatest difficultie, and we haue no cleere proofes of Scriptures for our conclusions, so long must mans presumption keepe silence. And euen of this question of not rebaptizing, he doth refutē it out of Scriptures ^c By (as he speaketh) certaine proofes, (and not by coniectures, as *Bellarmino* calleth them) before the definition of a Council. And heere also although *Bellarmino* be in part iustificable, yet looke vnto the sentence of *Cyprian*, and you shall find his reasoning negatiuely from Scripture (which is condemned by *Bellarmino*) to bee iustified by Saint *Augustine*, although it be there applied by him affirmatiuely.

^a Aug. de doct. christ. l. 2. c. 9.

^b Lib. 2. de peccat. merit. & remiss. ca. 36.

^c Contra Donatist. l. 1. c. 7. Tom. 7.

SECT. II.

The second exception against Bellarmine.

The charge concerning S. Peters Ordination.

3. **T**He summe of the exception standeth thus, *Bellarmino* defended that, ^a Saint Peter onely was ordeined a Bishop by Christ, and that the other Apostles were ordeined Bishops by Saint Peter: and endeououred to prooue this out of the testimonies of *Anacletus*, *Clement Alex.*, *Eusebius*, *Cyprian*, *Leo*, *Augustine*. But these Fathers (saith their ^b *Victoria*) do not intend that which the Authors of this opinion doe pretend. As for other writings which are attributed vnto *Clement*, and *Pope Anacletus*, which are both many and great, they are (saith their

^a Bellar. l. 1. de Rom. Pont. c. 23.

^b Relat. 2. §. 2. num. 3.

Cusanus l. 3. de
Concordia. 2.

Cardinallⁱ Cusanus) *Apocrypha*, wherein they, who extoll the
Romane Sea (which is worthy of all praise) do abuse that which
is convenient or meete, either wholly or partly rely, We are now
to Reckon, first for the matter it selfe, and then for the maner
of deliuerance of it in my *Preamble*.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reck. pag. 195.

ALL this which Mr. *Morton* alleadgeth heere, if it were graunted, as
it lieth, containeth nothing but two different opinions, between
learned men in a disputable question. Whether Christ did im-
mediately, and by himselfe, consecrate all or some of his Apostles Bi-
shops, or one onely with authoritie to consecrate the rest? *Turrecre-
mata* and *Bellarmino* doe hold the one for more probable, but *Victoria*,
Cusanus, and some other do allow rather the other. What wilfull false-
hood is there in this? Or is it not singular folly to call it by that name?

The Reueiwe.

Reck. p. 193.

pag. 194.

Mr. Parsons
crooked dissi-
mulation.

4. If all this were graunted Mr. Parsons? Then I can tell
you, you must either renounce the iudgement of *Bellarmino*,
or else recant your owne Reckoning: you have graunted first
that *Bellarmino* did prooue out of *Turrecremata* that Christ
did make onely Saint Peter Bishop, with authoritie to consecrate
the rest: Secondly, that *Victoria* thinketh the contrary opini-
on to be more probable, and answereth the argument of *Turre-
cremata* saying, that the Fathers cited for the same; *Renardus* non
significat id, quod *Authores huius sententia* volunt; That is,
That in truth they doe not signifie so much, as the authoritie
(Mr. Parsons should haue said *Authors*) of this opinion would
haue them: Lastly, that Cardinall Cusanus here cited, doth to
the like effect, answereth the same arguments.

¹ Bellar. lib. 1.
de Pont c. 27. §.
Secund. rat.

5. In all these confessed points consisteth the maine ma-
ter of my former exception: Notwithstanding this euidence,
Mr. Parsons saith, If it were graunted, &c. What tricke shall
we call this? Yet thus much being graunted, marke Master
Parsons, what will follow hereupon, viz. that the Church of
Rome hath lost her supposed Motherhood: For ¹ *Bellarmino*
presuming that all auncients held the Church of Rome to bee
the

the Mother-church, addeth in these words, *Quod non videtur, &c.* that is, *Which seemeth not to be true* (saith he) *except in that sense, because Peter, who was the Bishop of Rome, had ordained all other Apostles Bishops, either by himselfe, or by others.* See this, and blush at your ignorance, Bellarmine reasoneth thus: Except Peter did ordaine the rest of the Apostles Bishops, your Church of Rome cannot be truly called the Mother-church: but that Peter ordained the rest of the Apostles Bishops, Mr. Parsons doth hold it to be a matter *disputable*: their *Censures* thinketh it to be *improbable*, their *Victoria* concludeth *pro certo*, that *Certainly* Peter did not ordaine them Bishops. The conclusion will follow of it owne accord, which is this, viz. It is therefore but *Disputable*, or *Improbable*, yea an *Incredible* doctrine to say, that the Church of Rome is the Mother-church. When Mr. Parsons shall consider this, I thinke he will repent him of this Reckoning.

Rome by iust consequence is not the Mother-church.

Mr. Parsons ignorance.

6. May I be furthermore so bold with Mr. Parsons, as to demand: why he did translate [*Authores eius sententia*, that is, *The Authors of this opinion*] into *The authoritie of this opinion*? I say, what authoritie had he for these trickes, for of his purpose we will make no question: For he was loath that the opinion of Bellarmine should be held by any *certainely* false; or that such Authors as were *Anacletus, Clem. Alexandrinus, Cyprian, August. Leo*, should be thought to write against his opinion. The matter being thus cleere, for their conuiction, M. Parsons (according to his old guise) diuerteth his Readers eye from the matter vnto the manner of deliury, & first thus.

MR. PARSONS his Reckoning.

HE alleadgeth the sentence thus: that Saint Peter was the onely Bishop, and that the other Apostles took their Orders from him. Where he should haue said, Peter was ordained Bishop alone by Christ, he changeth Episcopall Consecration, into holy Orders. Rort. p. 192.

The Reuerſe.

7. Seeing that Peter onely is said to haue bene ordained Bishop, Loose and absurd cauils.

Bishop, who can imagine any ordainer but Christ? And the question being onely of *ordaining a Bishop*, how can the word *Holy orders* betoken any other orders, but those which are *Episcopall*, that is, the *Orders of Bishops*? Except Mr. *Parsons* transgresse so much, as to denie the orders of Bishops to bee *Holy*: which sheweth the exception, heere vsed by M. *Parsons*, to be but an arrant quarrell.

MR. PARSONS *his Reckoning.*

Recko. pag. 193.

WHereas he saith, that *Bellarmino* laboureth to euince from the testimonies of *Anacletus*, *Clement Alex.* &c. the prooffe of this prerogatiue; he abuseth him egregiously, for that *Bellarmino* doth alleadge this opinion, that Christ hauing all his Apostles Priests; did make onely S. *Peter* Bishop, with authoritie to consecrate the rest, as the opinion of *Turrecremata*, alleadging diuers manifest reasons and proofes for the same.

The Renewe.

8. *Bellarmino* contended to grace the Pope in *Peter*, and *Peter* with many prerogatiues aboue the other Apostles; The two and twentieth is this aboue mentioned, viz. *Peter alone was ordained Bishop by Christ, and the other Apostles by Peter.* This *Bellarmino* holdeth to haue beene Saint *Peters* prerogatiue, and then goeth about to defend it: but how hee is contented to reason from Cardinall *Turrecremata*, alleadging and allowing the same arguments and testimonies of Fathers as his owne, and in the end making the same conclusion which *Turrecremata* did, All this Mr. *Parsons* cannot denie, and yet behold forsooth an *Egregious abuse of Bellarmine*; but why? because *Bellarmino* doth alleadge the reasons of *Turrecremata*. As if Mr. *Parsons* seeing some dissolute Russian, borrowing a sword of an other, wherwith he doth wilfully kil a man, forthwith to be apprehended, and in due time condemned and executed, should runne vpon the iudge, and reuile him, saying, he did not the murther, for hee borrowed the sword: So it is, *Bellarmino* did borrowe the reasons of *Turrecremata*: but did vse them and applie them for the prooffe

A Simile, illustrating Mr. *Parsons* deceitful peeuishnes.

proofe of his owne conclusion, which by other Romish Doctors hath beene condemned as false.

9. Therefore in this so senselesse an accusation, the bent of Mr. Parsons malice doth shew it selfe, who furthermore wrgeth the leauing out of the word* [*fortasse*] in the testimony of *Cusanus*, when as he could not be ignorant that *Cusanus* doth immediatly after prooue them to be *Apocrypha* and counterfeit Epistles, which are attributed vnto *Anacletus* and *Clemens*. For first, *There is no mention* (saith he) *of them in any writings of antiquitie*. Secondly, *The Epistles themselves being but applied vnto the times of those Saints* (namely of *Anacletus* and *Clemens*) *they doe bewray themselves*: meaning that they are *Apocrypha*. Thirdly by their Contents; among others this, that *The writer of the Epistle of Clemens, fineth Clemens to haue written this Epistle vnto Iames Bishop of Ierusalem, after the death of Peter, whereas it is manifest* (saith *Cusanus*) *that Iames suffered Martyrdom eight yeeres before the death of Saint Peter*. So that you cannot be so much offended with me, for leauing out one word, as I am offended with my selfe, for omitting the large proofes of *Cusanus*, which doe make the matter without all *Peraduenture*.

* *Reckon. 194.*

1 concord. Cath. 13. c. 2.

His malignant lust of accusing his Aduersary.

Popes Epistles forged.

S E C T. III.

The third Exception against Bellarmine, concerning Platina.

" 10. * **B**ellarmine cyteth the testimony of (7) *Platina* for
 " the commendation of Pope *Hildebrand*: and in
 " another place finding *Platina* objected in the question of
 " Confession, answereth for disabling of the Authour, saying,
 " that (8) *Platina* had no publique authority to pen the lines of
 " the Popes from publique records: which is notably false,
 " *Platina* himselfe in his Epistle Dedicatory to the Pope, writ-
 " ting thus: (9) *Thou (O Prince of Divines, and chiefe of Bi-*
 " *shops) hast commaunded mee to write the lines of the Popes:*
 " whose

* *Preamb. pa. 67*

(7) *Extat. apud,*

Sc. Bellar. 14.

de Pont. c. 13. §

Extat.

(8) *Being vr-*

ged, &c.

(9) *In Theolo-*

gicum, &c.

Platina p. 26.

operis.

(10) Que Platina, &c. Balbus de Coronat. S. Post mortem.

" whose History is therefore greatly commended by Balbus " as being (10) True, and taken out of publique Monuments.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning, and charge of fraude.

Reck. cap 3. S. 15. pag. 197.

C Aluine cyting Platina thus: Eorum Annales dicunt. &c. Bellarm. answereth that neyther Platina did write those liues of the Popes by publique authority, nor out of publique Records: and addeth immediately, which M. Morton hath fraudulently cut off, *Vt Annales nostri dici possunt*, That they may be called our Annals.

The Reneiwe.

11. As though the denying that Platina had written them by *publique authority*, did not effectually enough denie them to be *Annales nostri*, that is, such *Annales*, or Histories, whereby you will be tryed. This is the point, speake somewhat to the purpose, for your Clyent expecteth your excuse.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reckon. pag. 198.

A Nd albeit Platina saith in the Preface of his History vnto the Pope Sixtus the fourth, who liued somewhat aboue 100. yeares past, that he had commaunded him to write the Popes liues, yet this proueth not that his collection is an authentickall History of our Church, or so well performed by him, as all things therein contained must be held for exact truth, and we bound to accept of the same, which is all in effect, that Card. Bellarmine auoucheth.

The Reneiwe.

12. Master Parsons, let me fore-warne you, that this *Answer* be not heard of at Rome, euen for your *Clyents* sake, if not for your owne. May not Rome call any writing of men *Nostri*, that is, *Ours*, except they be *Exactly true*; and which the Reader is bound so to accept of? By this answer, you are compellable to graunt that you haue no Histories at all in your Church, which you may iustly acknowledge: for how shall you be able to call any Authours, eyther *Annales nostri*, or *Pontifices nostri*, or *Patres nostri*, or *Iesuita nostri*, if in all

Mr. P. by his answer hath betraide the authority of almost all Romish Writers.

all things conteyned in their bookes, there must be necessarily required an *Exact Truth*? But M. Parsons was forced to answer somewhat.

13. The point in question is, why *Cabane* might not as well object the testimony of *Platina* against some Romish assertions, as *Bellarmino* might do for their defence; and whether his reiecting of *Platina*, as an Author not rightly authorized, were eyther reasonable, or conscionable? But now heare what M. Parsons doth iudge of *Platina*.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

THE censure of *Bellarmino* is true and prudent, concurring with the iudgement of diuers learned men of our time, especially of *Onuphrius Panvinus*, who writing obseruations vpon the history of *Platina*, doth oftentimes note the said History concerning Popes liues, of diuers defects, both in *Chronologie* of times, & truth of matters set down by him. And I doubt not but whosoever shall haue read the worke of *Onuphrius* and of *Balbus* here cyted in commendation of *Platina*, will greatly preferre the iudgement of the first before the latter in matters of History.

Reckon. p. 196.

The Renewe.

14. Must then *Onuphrius* be suffered to crowde out *Platina*, who is but a Commentator vpon *Platina*? Or shal *Onuphrius* be the Historian, whom you will acknowledge for authenticall, and whom you presume to be so *Exact*, that he may not be reiected? How is it then that your *Baronius* and *Onuphrius* can no better agree? If *Balbus* his commendations of *Platina* beare no credite with you, I will trie how *Barklains* may preuaile: he speaking of *Platina*, saith, *Haec ego auctor, &c. I will rather credit his Author Platina herein, then any other Historians, although they be more ancient, because he writ his Historie at the command of Sixtus quartus, and of other Popes. Here Barklains preferreth Platina before others, because of the Popes authority, M. Parsons notwithstanding the Popes authority preferreth Onuphrius: not that M. Parsons is lesse Papal, but because he is more partial whensoever any witnesse doth contradict his conceit.*

The authority of Platina.

m Baron. Anno. 44 num. 54. de Simone Mago. & Anno 253. n. 2. & Ano. 337 n. 73. & Anno 1001. n. 9. & A^o 1071 n. 15. n Barkl. de potestate Papa. c. 39.

CHAP. X.

Concerning Card. Bellarmine his false Allegations, for
proofe of Purgatory, in discussing whereof, the doctrine
of Purgatory is discovered.

SECT. I.

The first charge, concerning his cy-
tation of Ambrose.

* Preamb. p. 68.

(12) Lib. 1. de

Purg. cap. 6.

§. Deinde.

" 1. "

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"



Hereas hee professeth to bring in

(12) *Apertissima loca*, that is, *Most*

evident places out of the Fathers, for

proofe of Purgatory-fire already de-

scribed, hee produceth such testimo-

nies, which by his owne consequence do not concerne the

questioned *Purgatorie*: as first alleaging (13) *Ambrose* vpon

the *Psal. 118. Sermon. 20.* and yet *Ambrose* in that *Psal.*

118. saith, *All must passe throu those flames; whether Iohn*

or Peter, onely Christ, who is iustice it selfe, shall auoyde them.

Of the which place of *Ambrose*, *Bellarmino* saith, (14) *Am-*

brose understandeth not the fire of Purgatory, but the fire of

Gods iudgement.

MR. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reckon. 1. 3. §.

16 pag. 102

Bellarmino in the first place of *Ambrose*, saying, See *Ambrose* vpon *Psal. 118. Sermon. 20.* signifieth, that that Father hath something more for prouing Purgatory: and in his second booke cyting the same Sermon of *Ambrose* vpon the place of *Genesis*, [God hath placed a sword of fire, &c.] saith that it is rather to be vnderstood of the prouing fire of *Gods iudgements*. What contradiction is this? May there not be different sentences and senses in the same Sermon?

The Reuiewe.

2. Yes, there may, but when as in examination of that

Sen-

Sermon of Saint *Ambrose*, your selfe cannot finde any place, which speaketh of any fire, but that of Gods *seuere iudgement*, which *Bellarmino* hath said is not the fire of Purgatorie, you thereby confirme that which I haue said, that *Bellarmino* cyted *Ambrose* in a sense different from his meaning.

SECT. II.

The second charge, concerning his cytation of Hilary.

" 3. * **B**ellarmino cyted (15) *Hilary* in *Psal*, 118. vppon * *Preamb. p. 68.*
 " these wordes [*Concupiscit anima, &c.*] We (saith (19) *Lib. 1. de*
 " *Hilary*) must vndergo that indefatigable fire, in the which we *Purg. c. 6. §.*
 " must passe thorough the grievous punishments of purging of *Hilarius.*
 " soules. This he Reckoned among his most plaine places, for
 " proofe of Purgatory-fire: and notwithstanding else-where
 " alleaging the same text, saith of the Comment of *Hilary*,
 " that (16) *Hilary* doth therein insinuate, that the blessed Vir- (16) *Lib. 2. de*
 " gine ought to haue passed thorow the same fire, adding a little *Purg. c. 1. §.*
 " after, that (17) He (that is *Hilary*) herein by Purgatory, vn- *Idem videtur.*
 " derstood not the fire of Purgatory. (17) *Ibid. §.*
 " *Add.*

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

VV Hereunto is answered, that both are conteyned in that
 Discourse of *Hilary*, both the proouing fire of Gods iudgements after death, and the purging fire of Gods iustice. *Reckon. p. 303.*

The Reniew.

4. You should haue answered for the same place of *Hilary* which was objected: otherwise if you shal labor to prooue that *Bellarmino* meant, that both these fires were vnderstood in that one place, where he himselfe confesseth that the fire of Purgatory is not vnderstood, this would be as haplesse a worke, as if you had fought by contradicting *Bellarmino*, to free *Bellarmino* from contradiction.

SECT. III.

The charge of many false Allegations together.

* Preamb. p. 69. "5. **Y** Et againe, among his (17) manifest places for Purgatory, he alleageth (18) *Origen*, (19) *Basil*, (20) *Lactantius*, (21) *Hierome*, (22) *Ambrose*: all which are acknowledged expressly by (23) *Sixtus Senensis*, from the evidence of the contexts, to have spoken onely of the fire of the day of iudgement, and consequently, as *Bellarmino* hath taught vs, *Not of the fire of Purgatory*.

Deinde sunt. (18) *Origenes* " knowledge expressly by (23) *Sixtus Senensis*, from the evidence of the contexts, to have spoken onely of the fire of the day of iudgement, and consequently, as *Bellarmino* hath taught vs, *Not of the fire of Purgatory*.
 (19) *Basil* in *Isa. 9. Quod depascatur & deuoret ignis Purgatorius*: &c. (20) *Lactantius* l. 7. c. 21 *Perfringentur igne, atq; comburentur*: &c. (21) *Hieronymus* in *fine Clement in Isa. Quorum opera in igne probanda*: &c. (22) *Ambrosius* in *Psalm. 36. Non exuremur, tamen uremur*: &c. *Hic omnia Bellarmino* l. 1. de *Purg. c. 6. (23) Origenes* dixit, *Omnes homines, excepto Christo, aliquo modo urendos esse igne conflagrationis diuini iudicii. Et Hilarius una cum Ambrosio Origines scitatus est. Eodem pertineret videntur que Basilus annotauit: Ad eandem opinionem apparet alluisse Hieronimus; & longe ante Hieronimum quod Lactantius. Sixtus Senensis Bibl. 5. Annot. 171. Lactantius l. 7. c. 21. Perfringentur, inquit, &c. Loquitur de iis, qui in resurrectione sunt igni tradendi, Suarez l. 6. in par. 3. Thom. q. 59. art. 6. Disp. 57. Sect. 1.*

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Recko. pag. 205.

I Would demand of *M. Morton*, why we should ascribe more vnto the iudgement of *Senensis* in censuring these places of the Fathers, then vnto other learned, that thinke the contrary: They are all acknowledged (saith *M. Morton*) expressly by *Sixtus Senensis* from the evidence of their contexts, to haue spoken onely of the fire of the day of iudgement, and consequently not of Purgatory. This is now properly to helpe a Die indeed: for that *Senensis* doth not talke of any such evidence of the contexts, but speaketh rather doubtfully, and by coniecture, saying of *Origen*, that his opinion (that both good and bad should be purged by fire) is confuted by *S. Augustine* in his bookes de *ciuit. Dei*, but yet for excusing the same from error he saith: *Tu vide an Origines verba interpretari queant de igne ultima conflagrationis. Doc thou (Reader) consider whether the words of Origen may be interpreted of the fire of the last conflagration, or not; so as he did not expressly acknowledge from the evidence of the contexts, (as M. Mortons shifting and lying words are) that these authorities must needes be vnderstood of the last combustion of the world, but rather leaueth it as vncertaine to be considered by the Reader.*

The

The Renew.

6. I said indeed that *Senensis* by the evidence of contexts acknowledged the testimonies alleaged, to haue spoken of the fire of the day of iudgment, and consequently (according vnto *Bellarmines* doctrine) not of the fire of *Purgatory*. This you call *Shifting, Lying, and helping the Die*; but the perfect Cogger will presently appeare. For first I alleaged diuers testimonies, which might haue licensed me in a generalitie to say by the evidence of contexts, seeing that M. Parsons could take exception but onely to one.

7. And the truth is, that I cyted *Senensis* his *Biblioth. l. 5. Annot. 171.* who writeth thus: *Ambrose* seemeth to agree with *Origen*, who saith that all (Christ onely excepted) must be tried, and, in a sort, burne in the fire of the conflagration of Gods iudgement: Where *Senensis* expressly affirmeth, what his iudgment is concerning the sentence of *Origen*. To confute this M. Parsons fetcheth a skip out of *Senensis*, *Annot. 171.* backward vnto his *Annot. 170.* where *Senensis* saith of *Origen*, *Vide an. &c.* O confuter! *Origen* spake of a fire thorow which Apostles, Martyrs, and euery one, Except Christ, must passe. So that this could not bee the Romainish *Purgatory*-fire, for neither *Senensis*, nor any Romanist durst euer say, that Saints and Martyrs did euer take their voyage vnto heauen by hell. Thus then the [*Vide*] of *Senensis* bringeth no doubt in the cause, for it is still plain by the contexts, that by it is not meant your *Purgatory*-fire.

M. Parsons singular dexterity in falsehood.

8. Finally, to Mr. Parsons (demanding why I should ascribe more vnto the iudgement of *Senensis* then vnto *Bellarmino*?) I answer, because *Bellarmino* did write in his heate of altercation, but *Senensis* in the calme of contemplation. By which distinction, *Senensis* himselfe discerneth betweene the more and lesse iustificable sentences of holy Fathers. Albeit indeede I doe yeelde to *Senensis*, especially because of the evidence of his prooffe.

SECT. IIIL.

The next Charge against Bellarmine.

*Preamb. pa. 69
(25) Purgatori-
um ex Patribus
Græcis & Lai-
nis probamus.
Bellar. l. 1. de
Purg. c. 6.
(26) Omnes ve-
teres Græci Pa-
tres agnouerunt
Purgatorium, &
Scriptis suis luculentissime prodiderunt. Salmeron Ies. Comm. in 1. Cor. 15. disp. 15. in fine.
(27) Legat qui velis Græcorum veterum Commentarios, & nullum quantum opinor, aut rarissi-
mum de Purgatorio sermonem inuenies: Sed nos, Latini simul omnes huius rei veritatem concepe-
runt. Roffenl. Art. 18. aduers. Lutherum.

“ 9. **I**T followeth in the Preamble. Lastly, hee professeth
to confirme the Doctrine of Purgatory (25) out of
“ most of the Greeke and Latine Fathers: And an other Iesuit
“ saith more largely (26) Of all the Greeke Fathers, which is
“ an Assertion as false as peremptorie, euen by the confession
“ of their owne Bishop, saying, that (27) There is very rare
“ mention of Purgatory in the Greeke Fathers; and that the La-
“ tine Fathers did not all at first apprehend the doctrine thereof.

Mr. PARSONS his Reasoning.

Reckon. pag. 207.

Art. 18. con.
Luth.

THis is vnderstood by him as well of the name of Purgatorie, not then so much in vse, as that the most Ancient writers, next after the Apostles time, when many things were not discussed so exactly (as in proccesse of time they were) did not so clearly handle that matter: *Nemo iam dubitat orthodoxum* (saith he) *an Purgatorium sit, de quo tamen apud præcos illos nulla, vel quàm rarissima fiebat mentio.* No rightly beleeuing Christian doth now doubt, whether there be Purgatorie, or no, Of which notwithstanding there was none, or very rare mention made among those Ancient Fathers. Whereof hee giueth diuers reasons, and indeede the same may be said of sundry important other Articles of Catholicke Religion: For so much as in the first Primitiue Church, when the said Fathers were vnder Persecution, and occupied in other weightie affaires against Heretickes and Persecutors, they had not time, nor occasion to discusse many things, which the holy Ghost did afterward make more cleare to the Church by successe of time: And yet doth not B. Fisher say, that there was no knowledge of this Article of Purgatorie, in the very first Fathers; but onely his meaning was, that the name, nature, and circumstance thereof was not so well discussed, and consequently the thing more seldome mentioned by them, then afterward by the subsequent writers. And he after proueth it out of many Greeke and Latine Fathers, and out of Scriptures.

The

The Renewe.

10. Their Bishop *Roffensis* confesseth, that among the *Greeke Fathers*, there is *Rarissima mentio*, that is; *Most rare mention* of Purgatorie. M. Parsons translateth *Rarissima*, *very rare*, which is but a trick of a nibler. Againe, M. Parsons will haue vs to vnderstand *Roffensis* so, as though he had onely meant that, *The name, nature, and circumstances were not so well discussed or mentioned by ancient Grecians*. But *Roffensis* speaking of Purgatorie it selfe, saith that, ^a *Aliquandiu incognitum fuit*, — *Et sero cognitum vniuersa Ecclesie*, &c. ^a *Roffen. Art. 18. cont. Luther.* This is the confession of their owne Bishop *Roffensis*: That is, *Purgatorie was for a while unknowen, and not, till of late, knowne to the vniuersall Church*. With what assurance can the Romanists call the Doctrine Catholicke, that is, Vniuersall, which was not knowne vniuersally in the Primitiue Church of Christ? Yet hath Rome adopted this Article of *Purgatorie*, and suffered this Creeper to come into her newe ^b *Creede*, vnder the title of a doctrine *necessarie to saluation*. ^b *Bulla inuamenti annexa Conc. Trid.* But more of this hereafter.

S E C T. V.

The next Charge.

“ 11. IF any shall but obserue in this one Controuerſie, the ^a *Preamb. pag. 69. 70.* Number of witnesses brought in for confirmation of this their new Article, in the name of *Ancient Fathers*, which are (by the confession of our Aduersaries) meerely counterfeited, as *Clemens his Constitutions*, *Clemens his Epistles*, *Athanasius in Question*, *Eusebius Emisennus*, *Iosephus Bengorion*, *Hieron. in Prouerb. August. ad fratres in Exemo*, the *Liturgies of S. Iames*, and others: All which, as they are vrged for prooffe of *Purgatorie*, so are they reiected by their owne men (I desire to be challenged for prooffe hereof) as *Forged*, or *Corrupted*, or *Apocrypha*, &c.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reck. pag. 210.

HE cannot be trusted in any thing he saith: For these are not so much as named by *Bellarmino* (except onely the two first in a word or two) much lesse are they brought in for principall Authors in the Catalogue of Ancient Fathers, whose Authorities he setteth downe for prooffe of Purgatorie. So as this is one deceitfull vntueth, to make his Reader beleue, that these are our chiefe Authors, whereas *Bellarmino* besides these, doeth alleadge twentie, viz. Ten of the Greeke Church, and as many of the Latine.

The Reuiew.

M. Parsons tri-
ple falshood.

c *Bellar. lib. 1. de*
Purg. c. 6. §.
Euseb. Emill.
d *Ibid. c. 7. §.*
Tertia ratio.
e *Ibidem cap. 5.*
§ *Accedant.*

13. But if this Answer of *M. Parsons* bee fraught with grosse vntueths, what saith shall any man giue vnto him? First, I named not *Bellarmino* in that place, but spake in generall of the ordinarie practise of our Adversaries, in alleadging corrupt and counterfeit writers. Secondly, I called not the foresaid Authors either chiefe, or principall, as *M. Parsons* pretendeth. And lastly, in saying that *Bellarmino* nameth but the two first of the foresaid Writers, viz. *Clemens his Constitutions* and *Athanasius*, is a notable falshood: for *Bellarmino* alleadgeth *Eusebius Emiffenus*,^d *Iosephus Bengorion*, and *S. Iames his Liturgie*. So that I know not what *M. Parsons* meant by his denying of this, except happily he laid some wa-
ger of falsifying, and meant to winne it.

M^r. PARSONS his Reckoning, and Charge
against his Adversarie.

Reck. pag. 211

SEcondly it is an other manifest vntueth, to say that our Doctors do confesse all these Authors to be meerly counterfeit. For albeit some of them be excepted against, or called in question by some Writers, whether they be the true workes of the Authors, whose names they beare, or not, and thereof all reputed *Apocryphall*, that is, hidden or obscure: Yet it followeth not that they are meerly counterfeit, for that they may bee ancient workes, and not to be condemned, though not of those Authors.

The

The Renewe.

14. M. Parsons is so transported with passion, that hee hath forgotten the last clause, which I vsed concerning these Authors, to wit, that they are either *forged*, or *corrupted*, or *Apocrypha*; and so *Apocrypha*, as being sometime not *Obscure* onely, but euen to be *condemned*. Whereof in these and others, I shall giue him such a taste, before we end our Reckoning, as may, I thinke, soone set his teeth on edge.

SECT. VI.

The last Charge.

“ 15. IF he shall furthermore marke (said I) how true Fa- * *Preamb. p. 70*
 “ thers and Scriptures are instanced in, for prooue of
 “ the same Article, whereof (when I speake of Fathers) most
 “ of them; (when I speake of Canonicall Scriptures) all of
 “ them are found, by the iudgement of their owne Doctors,
 “ to be tortured, wrestled, and forced, as it were, to say that
 “ which they neuer meant, &c.

MR. PARSONS his Reckoning.

THIS now, whether it be not such a wilfull and witting Lie, as before I described for a formall malicious Lie, such as the Writer did know to bee a Lie, when he wrote it, I am content to remit my selfe vnto any iudicious and ciuill Protestant in the world. For if our owne Catholicke Doctors doe finde this in their owne iudgement, how doe they belecue Purgatorie to be true? Why doe they not change their opinion, and become Protestants? Can M. Morton answere any thing vnto this lewde and wilfull absurditie, and did he not know that he lied when he writ this? *Reckon. p. 211*

The Renewe.

16. What meaneth our *Quiet Reckoner* to reuell so turbulently? Will he needes falsifie his owne title? The Assertion which I made, and which hee calleth a *Formall malicious* *M. Parsons vn-quiet Reckoning.*

Lie, is put vnto the triall in the next Chapter, where it will be auouched to be an obseruable, iust, and incontrollable trueth. The reason, which hee opposed, I shall now confute in this Section, and compell him to repent his loose tearmes, by an instance, which will manifestly discover a Romish malladie.

17. The Doctrine of *Indulgences* hath beene of late put into their *Romane Creede* in their Councell of *Trent*, by the Bull of Pope *Paulus* the fourth. This their Doctors will beleeue, albeit they confesse, concerning *Indulgences*, that
 & *There is not found any expresse sentence, either in Scriptures, or in the writings of Ancient fathers; and that in the beginning of the Primitiue Church there was no vse of them, nor yet did they come in vse, vntill the feare of a fierie Purgatorie had brought them out.* Who, while they pleade for *Indulgences*, doe it in this manner, viz. ^h *Indulgences are not therefore to be contemned, because the vse of them seemeth to haue beene but of late in the Church, for many things are knowne by posteritie, which the ancient writers were ignorant of.* Which we take to be a kind of cracke in their cause, especially seeing that, for want of better light of Antiquitie, they are glad to collect an Antiquitie of them from the *Stations* vsed anciently at *Rome*. Now what were these *Stations*? Their *Onuphrinus* doeth tell you. ¹ *The word (saith he) commeth of Stando, standing, because the people in their solemne Conuents did stand: For the ancient Bishops of Rome vpon some set dayes, especially in Lent and Holydayes, did goe vnto diuers Churches of Rome, where a Sermon was made vnto the people there standing, and saying Prayers, they did afterward communicate with the Clergie and people of Rome in the Diuine Sacraments. In all which, there is no sent of Romish Indulgences.*

& *Roffens. Art. 18*

Indulgences,
being their
noueltie

^h *Alfonfus lib. 8.*
aduers. Heres.
Tit. Indulgentie.

Stations.

¹ *Onuph. in Platinam, interp. vocum Ecclesiast.*

^h *Agrippa de vanit. Scient. cap. 61.*

¹ *Bellar. l. 1. de Indulg. c. 2. in the Argument of the Chapter.*

18. Againe, we find them obserue, that ^h *Pope Boniface the eight* (about the yeere 1300.) was the first who extended *Indulgences* vnto *Purgatorie*: Which is the *Indulgence* where-vpon we dispute. Besides, they tell vs, that the inuisible spirituall Treasure of the Merits of Holy men, is the ¹ *Foundation of Indulgences*: Notwithstanding, *Maivonis* and *Durand*, two of your principall Schoolemen euen of later times,
 Doub-

^m Doubted of the truth of such a Treasure. And lastly, that some, whom they call *Catholikes*, iudged no otherwise of these kinde of *Indulgences*, then of " *Godly deceits*. Heere we see more then a glimpse of that light, which we professe, acknowledged by your *owne* Doctors. I must hereupon make bolde to demaund of Mr. *Parsons*, why their Doctors, hauing so great an apparence of the noueltie of this Article, did notwithstanding still yeelde vnto the praistise of their Church? When he shall answere this, then may he easily satisfie himselfe, concerning his last demaund.

^m As Bellarm. confesseth, *ibid*
ⁿ Greg. Valent.
 1^o de Indulg.
 c. 2.

Master PARSONS his Reckoning.

Bellarmine hath alleaged ten seuerall testimonies out of the Scriptures of the old Testament (with the expositions of the auncient Fathers vpon them) which are confessed by Protestants to be Canonically, excepting the *Maccabees*, and *Toby*. which were notwithstanding Canonically in *S. Augustines* time, by the third Councell of Carthage, in which himselfe was present. And out of the new Testament he alleageth fise other places, with the expositions in like manner of the Fathers vpon them, that vnderstood them to meane of Purgatory. And will our owne Doctors say that these fiseene places are all *tortured and forced* against their meaning? and all the Fathers expositions violated against their owne iudgement? If our Doctors will say so, they must be *M. Morions* Doctors, and not ours.

Recko. pag. 213.

The Reniewe.

19. It is a thing superfluous, *Altum agere*. This which I say of the principall places of Canonically Scriptures, wherein your Doctors doe most insist, I haue proued^o also, from the meere literal Expositions of your owne Doctors to be inforced beyond compasse, and want not a supply of like Answers vnto other Scriptures, which haue beene omitted. But I shall not need to insist vpon places of Scripture, the rather becaufe I am not so greatly prouoked by M. *Parsons* heereunto, who hath reserued his maine violence for the tryall of *Fathers*.

^o Cath. Appeal.
 L. 1. c. 2. §. 17.
 And as for the obiection from the Councell of Carthage, it is satisfied, *ibid*
 L. 4. c. 18. §. 1.

20. Yet notwithstanding, one confession of Bellarmine may not be so easily let passe, which hath not bene mentioned.

p Bellar. l. i. de
Purg. c. 4. §. Et
igitur.

No place of
Scripture
wherein fire
can plainly
signifie Purga-
torie fier.

ned in my Appeale, to wit, *p Cū nusquam in Scripturis fiat mentio ignis, ubi aperte de Purgatorio agitur, nihil dubium est, quin Cyprianus ad hunc locum respexerit.* That is, Seeing that in no place of Scripture, where Purgatory is plainly handled, any mention is made of fire, it is not to be doubted, but that S. Cyprian had respect unto this place of Scripture, to wit, 1. Cor. 3. where it is written, *He shall be saved as it were by fire*: Which is a sufficient confession, that there is not in any place of Scripture any mention of fire, wherein there is any plaine prooffe of Purgatory, except in these fore-cyted wordes of 1. Cor. 3. And can he say that this onely place is plaine for Purgatory fire? By no meanes: for Bellarmine confesseth hereof, that ancient Expositors doe not agree in the interpretation of fire in this place: *Some vnderstand by fire the Tribulations of this life, some the eternall torments, some the fire of the last day, and some the Purgatory fire.* How shall our aduersaries presume of any plain place of Scripture for prooffe of Purgatory-fire, seeing that this their onely plaine place is thus obscured and perplexed with foure different Interpretations?

CHAP. XI.

The earnest challenge which Mr Parsons hath made, that I should disannull the allegations of the testimonies of those Fathers, whom Iodocus Coccius hath cyted for prooffe of the Romish Purgatory.

SECT. I.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Recken. p. 218.



Coccius produceth vpon the point of threescore Authours, within the compasse of the first fixe hundred yeares, that confirme the common faith of that Church in those dayes, to haue held Purgatory, and prayer for the dead, for Catholike doctrine, and for the practise also of praying for the soules departed.

TO VVHAT END DO YOU SAY THIS

M.

M. PARSONS? To the end that T. M. may haue somewhat to do, I doe earnestly challenge him herein, requiring at his handes, that of the first 60. mentioned by Coccins within the first 600. yeares, he doe really and sincerely proue 31. at least, which is the major part, to be so tortured, and so graunted by the iudgement of our Writers; or else he saileth wholly in his cause. * Reckon. p. 212

The Reueiue.

2. There is none, I thinke, but will holde it a point of wisdom in M. Parsons, to set mee rather to combate with Coccins, then to suffer me to *Encounter* himselfe, by manifesting his owne singular falsifications; which notwithstanding, by his leaue, I must performe, before we end our Reckoning. In the meane time, I willingly yeelde vnto his present challenge, wishing that I had him in a good Obligation by oath, that he will as willingly accord vnto the euidence of those things, which shall be reuealed. And now I enter the Lists,

That the testimonies of Fathers, and other Antiquities, alledged by Coccins, for defence of Romish Purgatorie, are, for the most part, cyther out of booke falsly fathered, and unwarantable; or else, out of true testimonies falsly applied. The tryall of both which dependeth vpon cert aine general Observations. a Coccins The-
saur. Tom. 2. l. 7.
Art. 5.

The two first.

3. For my more plaine and expedite discharge of this Challenge, I shall request the Reader to passe along with me, in reuiewing some confessed *Observations*, which will make clearely for the conuiction of Coccins, whereunto the particular testimonies must haue a necessary relation; which may be thus distinguished: The first *Observation* is, that the Authors and testimonies which shall be confessed to bee cyther forged, or corrupted with heresies, or else *Apocrypha*, may not be thought to be of sufficient credite.

Counterfeit,
Apocrypha,
corrupted,
wrested.

4. The second *Observation* may bee taken out of their Iesuite Suarez, where he saith, that *They that thinke that the soules* b Suarez Te'nita
Tom. 2. in Thom.
q. 52. art. 6. sect.
1. disp. 57 S.
Veruntamen.

The opinion
of receptacles
of soules:
without both
heaven and
hell.

^c Lactant. l. 7.
Inst. cap. 1. as
Suarez noteth,
ibid. q. 54. art. 4.
sect. 3. §.

Quarto loco:
^a Senens. bibl.
l. 6. Annot. 345.
^c Renatus
Laurentius
Annot. in Tert.
de Testimonio
anima p. 519.
saith, Omnes
fere antiqui in
ea fere sententia
erant, ut puta-
rent animos
iustorum non esse
omnino beatos
ante resurrecti-
onem.

soules of men are not indged in death, nor that they receive eyther paine, or reward, but are reserved in secret receptacles unto the vniuersall iudgement, they doe consequently acknowledge, non purgari, i. e. That men are not purged before the generall resurrection and iudgement: whereupon it must follow, that they are to be purged in the day of the Conflagration, &c. but to say that some soules of the iust are not purged, untill they be united with the body, and so receive purgation in the fire of conflagration, both in their bodies and soules; although it doe not contradict the principles of our Faith, yet is it utterly false and erroneous. So Suarez. His Consequence is plaine: They that taught secret receptacles of soules voyd of paine or of reward, untill the day of the general resurrection, do denie the Romish doctrine of Purgatorie torment, before the last day; but diuers Fathers (by our Aduersaries confessions) taught such kinde of Receptacles of soules of all the faithfull, as namely, ^c Lactantius, so saith Suarez: And ^d Senensis, where he relateth the sentences of diuers Fathers, who seeme to haue inclined to the same opinion, after that he had excused some by name, he leaueth Irenaeus, Iustine Martyr, Tertullian, Clemens Romanus, Origen, Lactantius, Theodoretus, Theophylact, Oecumenius, Euthymius vnto the discretion of his Reader, thus farre to excuse them, if he cannot acquit them, because in their dayes the Church had not defined any thing, concerning that Article. Which is, by Suarez his consequence, to graunt that, in that aunient time, Romish Purgatory was no Catholicke doctrine of faith,

The third Obseruation is concerning the diuers significations of the word Fire.

Diuers accep-
tions of the
word Fire.

^o Ribera Ies. in
Mala. 3. nu. 18.
^f Bellar. l. 1. de
Purg.
^g Idem l. 1. de
Purg. c. 1. §.
Quarta.

5 VVe are furthermore necessarily to consider the confessed differences of the word *Fire*, vsed in the testimonies of Fathers; as first by *Fire* vnderstanding the ^e Holy Ghost, which purifieth and purgeth the soule from sinne: And of this Bellarmine confesseth, that it ^f Doth not signifie that Purgatorie fire, which is now controuerted: Or secondly, signifying the ^g Tribulations of this life, whereof he likewise confesseth, that

It

It maketh not for the now questioned Purgatory. Or, Thirdly, betokening *The seuerer iudgement of God* (euen after death) by onely trying and examining the actions which men haue committed in this life: which (as our ^h Aduersaries accordingly confesse) doth not concerne the question of Purgatory fire, ^h Bellar. ibid. c. 4 §. Superest. which they hold to be not onely an Intellectuall fire of trying and examining, but also of tormenting and purging, because the Trying and examining iudgement is in regard of the *workes*, by iudging them vnprofitable, but the purging and tormenting fire doth leaze onely vpon the *Workers*. Or, Fourthly, noting fire of conflagration in the day of Doome, when all the world shall be on a flame: which, as Bellarmine acknowledgeth, is not that Purgatory fire, which he in the name of their Church vnderooke to defend, because, as some thinke, all mettals, as well Gold and Silver, as Wood and Stubble, that is, as well the godly Saint, as the lesse sanctified, must passe thorow the fire of conflagration: Or, Lastly, specifying the fire of Hell of the damned, which is eternall, as it is onely a Tormenting fire, but not purging: for the purging fire (saith ⁱ Bellarmine) is temporall, and not eternall.

ⁱ Bellar. l. 2. de Purg. c. 6 §. Octaua cit.

6. If then Coccinus shall bee found to abuse the testimonies of Fathers so notoriously, as to mistake the fire of the Holy Ghost (which purgeth the soule by sanctification) in stead of the fire of vexation: or the fire of Tribulation (which is in this life) in stead of fire after death: or the fire of Gods iudgement (which is onely in the examination of workes) in stead of the fire of torment: or the fire of conflagration (which is onely in the last day) in stead of fire presently after death: or the fire of the damned in Hell (which is eternall) in stead of the fire which is temporall: then, I suppose, Mast. Parsons will be ashamed of his choyce, in making Coccinus his Champion in this cause of Purgatory.

The fourth Observation, in remoouing our Aduersaries Objection, taken from Prayers, Sacrifice, and Oblations for the dead.

7. The generall and most popular Argument, wherewith
S
our

℥ Bellar. l. 1. de
Purg. c. 11. § De
quarto.

℥ Reckon. 118.

Sacrifice, Prayer
& Oblation

℥ Bellar. l. 2. de
Purg. c. 6

℥ See hereafter
Sixtus Senenf.
bibl. l. 6. Annot.
47. § In his
* Ibidem, citeth
some Doctors
who thus
thought.
℥ Suarez, Jof.
Tom. 4. in Thom.
diſp. 47. §. 1.
* Senenfis quo
ſuprà.

℥ Bellar. l. 2. de
Purg. c. 11. §. Ad
primū.

our Aduerſaries uſe to vnderprope the ruinous ſtructure of their Purgatory, is this, that *The Fathers* (ſaith *Bellarmino*) *prayed for the dead*, Ergo, they beleaued Purgatory: and from this he ſaith, that *Purgatory is evidently collected*; wherein *M. Parsons* is peremptory, ſaying, that *To pray for the ſoules departed doth neceſſarily ſuppoſe Purgatorie*: and this ſeemeth to be the ſcope of *Coccius* in moſt of his allegations, wherein nothing will be found more frequent for the prooſe of their Purgatory, then onely the offering prayers, Oblations, and Sacrifice for the dead.

8. For confutation of our Aduerſaries Conſequence, it will be ſufficient to appeale vnto our Adnerſaries confeſſions, who doe readily graunt that *Prayers, Sacrifices, Commemorations* and *Oblations* haue bene uſed for the dead, without all reſpect of their Purgatory torment: as firſt in regard of the ſoules of the *Damned*, whom *Bellarmino* denieth to be in Purgatory, and there is good reaſon thereof, becauſe the fire of the hell of the damned is a fire of *Satiſfaction* onely, and not of *Expiation*. And yet notwithstanding we read that ſome Ancients prayed for the damned ones (eſpecially ſuch as died in the profeſſion of Chriſtian faith) whether it were for their abſolute deliuerance out of hell, which was the error of *Origen*, or elſe, as ſome others haue done for the mitigation of their torment, which, euen in the opinion of our Aduerſaries, is reiecteſt as erroneous: ſo that from prayers made for the *damned*, to conclude that there is a *Purgatory fire* of them who are to be ſaued, is, by *M. Parsons* leaue, but a wide and wilde conſequence, and an abuſe of ſuch teſtimonies, becauſe in caſe of bearing witneſſe, both a condemned opinion and a condemned perſon are equally incompetent.

9. The ſecond ſtate of ſoules departed is of the Saints in *Bleſſedneſſe*, who are not in Purgatory, and yet haue ſome Fathers offered both *Sacrifice* and *Prayers* for them: for of *Sacrifice* *Bellarmino* confeſſeth: *Sacrifice* (ſaith he) *was offered for Saints*: but how? *Not* (ſaith he) *that we may aſke any thing for them, but that we may gae thanks to God for the glorie, which he conferred vpon them*. And this prayer was found in their Ro-

Romish Mistfall, to wit, *Grant O Lord, we beseech thee, that this Prayer may profit the Soule of blessed Leo.* Bellarmine will haue vs to vnderstand that these kind of requests were
 1 Possibly for the glorifying of the bodies of the Saints (albeit the Prayer is said to be for his soule) in the day of Resurrection.

1 Ibidem, 5.
 Præterea Secundo & deinceps, 5.
 Adde tertio.

10. This confession likewise strangleth Bellarmines opinion, and M. Parsons his Consequence, except they will iudge it no impietie to thinke, and that necessarily, that Pope Leo and other glorious Saints, are tormented in Purgatorie. Furthermore, *It was an vsuall custome* (as saith Cassander) *that oblations were made for Martyrs, when as thanksgiving was used for them, and when the mysticall action, wherein Christ his body is presented, there was mention made of them, as it appeareth out of Cyprian and Augustine, and as it is expressed in the Greeke Liturgie, saying that the unbloody worship is offered for the Virgine Mary, and for the Apostles, and Martyrs.* And all the good, which their Suarez will acknowledge to accrew vnto the blessed Saints by our *Oblations and Sacrifices* (which are, saith he, *our giving of thanks for them*) is not any degree of essentiall glory, but onely an extrinsecall, such as they knowing our Prayers doe reioyce thereat. By this also Master Parsons his necessarie consequence (concluding from offering of Prayers and Sacrifice for the dead, a Purgatorie torment of them) is found to bee a notable falshood, and delusion, by confounding Prayers of thanksgiving, with Prayers of supplication; and the state of the Blessed with the condition of men tormented, and in effect heaven with hell.

* Cassander consult. Art. 24.
 See more fully confessed hereafter. n. 55.

* Cultus incrementus.

* Suarez Tom. 4. in Thom. disp. 48 § 4 nu. 10.

11. The third respect of soules, mentioned by the Fathers, is when the Soule entresth either into the Examination of Gods severe iudgement, or else through the flame of the conflagration of fier in the last day, through which all Soules must passe with their bodies: In both which respects, wee heare some Fathers praying for the dead departed, albeit neither of these conditions doe imply the Romish Purgatorie, as Bellarmine hath confessed.

* See abo 18 num. 5.

12. If therefore Coccius shall bee found to cite, for defence of their imagined Purgatorie, Prayers made for the dam-

ned, in stead of Prayers for the *Godly*; or made for the *Blessed*, to prooue that men are *Tormented*; or *Sacrifices* and Prayers of *Commemoration* and *Thanksgiving*, in stead of Prayers of *Deprecation*; or Supplications for the perfect consummation of happineffe, in the eternall rest of both body and soule, in stead of Prayers for redemption out of an hellish Prison, and other such like incongruities and abuses; Then must M. *Parsons* with that he had made some other challenge. And now I betake my selfe vnto the particular Examination of his Allegations: First of *Liturgies*, and then of *Fatbers*.

S E C T. II.

Coccius his Allegations of ancient Liturgies, for prooue of Romish Purgatorie, abused.

M^r. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reckon. p. 218.

Coccius alleadgeth ten *Liturgies*, as that of *Ierusalem*, *Rome*, &c. All which were in vse in the Churches of the Christian Countries, aboue the space of a thousand yeeres agone, in all which there is Prayer for soules departed: All which doe necessarily infer Purgatorie.

The Reuiew.

* See aboue,
num. 7.

13. This *Consequence* for Purgatorie we haue * prooued to be so drouisie, that it may seeme to neede a Purgatorie fier to purge it, which may be further confuted by the same *Liturgies*. But first seeing Cardinall Bellarmine, in answering vnto an obiection taken out of the *Liturgie* of *Hiernusalem*, passing vnder the name of Saint *Iames*, (which *Liturgie* Coccius rangeth in the forefront of his battell) could say that * *All things which are contained in the Liturgie of Saint Iames, and others, are not taken from the example and precept of Christ, for it is manifest* (saith he) *that many things haue bene added by others*; They may bee as iustly excluded by vs, with an Earemarke of *Apocrypha*: Which were no hard matter to euince by

* Bellarm. lib. 4.
de sch. cap. 13.
de reg. oblat.

by many reasons, if M. *Parsons* his *Challenge* would suffer me to vse that weapon, and not force me (as hee hath done) to insist vpon the Collections from the confessed principles of the Romanists.

14. Notwithstanding, to admit for the present these *Liturgies* alleadged by *Coccinus*, I will begin at the last, the *Liturgie of the Armenians*, because it may best explaine the rest. In it we reade thus: *Giue eternall peace, O Lord, vnto all that before vs haue departed in the Faith of Christ, the Holy Fathers, Patriarkes, Apostles, Prophets, Martyrs, &c. Pray yee vnto the Lord for the Soules that rest in peace.* Here is a Prayer wee see, for Peace vpon soules, euen *Apostles, Martyrs, &c.* whom it prooueth to bee in Peace: Which cannot signify any thing, but the desire of the consummation of blessednesse in their bodies and soules, at the day of the generall Resurrection; And plainly demonstrateth, that M. *Parsons* his former consequence, which from the Prayer concluded a *Purgatorie punishment*, is marueilously false, because in this *Liturgie* we heare of Prayers for the peace of *Apostles and Martyrs*, whom no Christian heart can fancie to be in *Purgatorie Torment*. The *Liturgie of Alexandria*, attributed to Saint *Marke*, and praying for *Requiem*, that is, *A rest for the Soules of Fathers, and Brethren, who are a sleepe in Christ; being mindfull of our Ancestors, Fathers, Patriarkes, Prophets, Apostles, &c.* may seeme to admit the former Exposition. So likewise the *Liturgie of Constantinople*, ascribed vnto Saint *Chrysostome*, carieth this tenour: *Be mindfull, O Lord, of thy seruants, who haue sinned, and pardon them, for there is none but they haue sinned, excepting thee, O Lord, who canst giue rest to them that sleepe.* The *Liturgie of Ethiopia* is for all that rest in a true faith: Of *Cappadocia*, for all that sleepe in the hope of the Resurrection vnto eternall life: Of *Rome*, giue place of refreshing for all that rest in Christ; and so we may thinke of the rest. Yet may not any conclude vpon these Prayers, that All Soules, that are departed in the faith of Christ, were therefore in *Purgatorie*.

15. Will *Coccinus* (trow we) bee more circumspect in cy-

ting the *Fathers*? I must trie this; and because *M. Parsons* hath begunne to Recken vpon ten *Liturgies*, I will bring in the *Fathers* also by Decades, or tens, and see, whether I can satisfie *M. Parsons* in his exacted number of thirtie and one.

S E C T. III.

The Greeke *Fathers* abused by *Coccius*, for prooffe of *Romish Purgatorie*.

THE FIRST DECAD.

16. **T**He first Father, whom *Coccius* produceth, is *Clemens Epist. 1. Quotidiana, &c.* Which *Epistle Card. Turcremata* reiecteth, as being doubtfull, saith their *Sixtus Senensis*, adding from himselfe, that It is not possible that *Clemens* should haue written this *Epistle vnto S. Iames, &c.* And *Bellarmino* noting the same error in the fifth *Epistle* of this *Clemens*, calleth the Authour *silensius Clemens*, that is, A forged *Clemens*. Where was the braines of *M. Parsons*, when he set me a worke to prooue some of these witnessses to be, as I called them, *Knights of the Poste*, seeing that this *Clemens*, (as hee might haue well knowne) is dubbed such a *Knight* by their owne Doctores, and yet this *Clemens* happeneth to bee the chiefe of this Inquest.

17. The second witnessse is *Clemens* his *Constitut. lib. 8. cap. 41. Oremus, &c.* who may passe for an Author of the same *Knighthood*, for although their Iesuite *Turrian*, laboured to free these Bookes from exception; Yet doth the Iesuite *Possennius*, call his Reasons rather *Coniectures* then *Arguments*. And the *Sixt Council* noted these eight Bookes to haue beene corrupted by Heretickes, as their owne *Bishop* testifieth: The same doeth *Cardinall Baronius* affirme, and in answering an obiection taken out of these Bookes, calleth his answer *Honestum confugium*.

18. The third Author is *Dionysius Areopagita, Hierarch. cap. 7. part. 2. Postea, &c.* Which Bookes *Cardinall Caietane*, and

^a Senens. Bibl. li.
^{2.} Tit. Clemens

^b Bellar. l. 3. de
bonis operib. c. 11
§ Ceterum
non.

^c Possennius Jes.
Apparat. Tit.
Clemens.

^d Epist. August.
de Emendat.
Gratiani Dialog.
6. pag. 47.

^e Baron. Anno
101. num. 9. &
An. 31. num. 18.
& 19.

and many others (saith [†] Senensis) did make doubt of, whether they were the Bookes of Dionysius Areopagita. [†] Neither durst S. Gregorie (saith Caietan himselfe) affirme these to be the same Dionysius his Bookes; Wherein there was one point of Doctrine, [†] Which S. Gregorie would not allow (as witnesseth their Iesuite Ribera) lest that he might seeme to contradict the sacred Scriptures. In briebe, [†] Guiselmus Grocinnus, Dimittit Reader in S. Paules, reading Lectures out of these Bookes, before the end of his Lectures, concluded that they were not the proper workes of that Dionysius. Therefore may we dismiss him as a *ψευδοτύπος*. Although, if we shall allowe him for a legitimate Author, we shal not loose, but gaine by the Reckoning: for Dionysius sheweth that such Prayers (although made for the remission of the finnes of the dead) were rather protestations, that their finnes were now forgiven, then Supplications for their forgiveness: where he will haue every Christian to hope confidently, that after his death, he shall not change this life for a worse estate.

19. The fourth is *Hermes, Viscont 3. De triumpho, &c.* who presseth in to beare witness, albeit their owne ancient Pope Gelasius, hath taken sufficient exception against him, [†] Who calling these Bookes Apocryphall (saith Bellarmine) which were set forth either by Hereticall Authors, or else by such as were suspected of Heresie, ^m did reiect *Hermes* as Apocryphall: which Author also ⁿ Prosper reiected and iudged to be of no authority. And is not this enough to deserue such a Knightschip?

20. *Origen* is the fifth, who foloweth *Hermes* at the heeles, whose name although it bee famous, yet ^o His workes (saith Senensis) were corrupted with innumerable heresies, by the fraude of ancient Hereticks, who sought to branch their impious Doctrines, vnder the fauour and grasse of the name of *Origen*: which writings, if in any thing they seeme to loose credit, then especially where he intreateth of the State of Soules departed: in which respect, ^p *Origen* was (saith Driedo) reprehended of ancient Fathers; And in the same regard is hee reiectd by Bellarmine, euen for holding that, [†] All (except Christ) whether good or euill, must be purged; and that all the

[†] Senensis Biblio. l. 6. annot. 2. 29.
[†] Cardin. Caiet. in Act. 17.

[†] Ribera Jesh. in Heb. 1. num. 99.

[†] Erasmus Annot. in Act. 17.

^x Hierarch. Eccl. § Hæc quidem.

[†] Bellar. l. 2. de verbo Dei. c. 20. §. Vox ignis.

^m Ibid. §. Nec minus.

ⁿ Baron. Anno. 159. num. 56.

^o Senens. Biblio. 6. Tit. Origenes §. Cæterum.

^p Driedo lib. 4. de varijs dogmat. c. 1. fol. 109.
[†] Bellar. l. 2. de Purg. cap. 1. §. Primus. & §. Secundus.

wicked

wicked, yea the diuels shall in the end be saved, viz. after that for a long time, they haue suffered the extreame paines of Hell. Notwithstanding, if we should admit *Origen* for a competent witnesse, yet his testimonies doe not reach home vnto the Romish Purgatorie. The first, *Hom. 14. in Leuit.* Some finnes are so light that they are compared to stubble, which cannot continue long in the fire. The second, *Hom. 25. in Num.* Thou seest that euery one that passeth out of this life, needeth a purification (meaning by fire) for I dare say that none can bee cleane, as the Scripture speaketh. The third in *Psal. 38.* He talketh of Caldrons of decoction. In the fourth, *Hom. 12. in Hier. 12.* God is a consuming fire, and will consume that which is matter for fire, as Wood, Hay, Stubble, &c. I answer, that the Answer, which their owne *Senensis* giueth vnto other places of *Origen*, may satisfie these which are now objected (for the Tenure of all is alike) vide *Origen* in *Pf. 36.* All men (Christ onely excepted) must passe thorow the fire of conflagration. And againe, in *Psal. 118.* All men must be tried by fire, whether it be lohn the Euangelist, or others. And yet againe, in *Hier. hom. 31.* All that haue sinned after Baptisme must be purged by the fire of conflagration. Wherein (saith *Suarez*) *Origen* seemeth to allude vnto his owne error, &c. And *Bellarmino* lighting vpon these wordes of *Origen* in *Luc. 14.* After the resurrection euery soule must suffer a purging fire, saith, that These wordes of *Origen*, will not admit any commendations exposition. Still wee see that the fire which *Origen* speaketh of, being that fire of conflagration in the last day, is not the Romish Purgatory.

21. *Eusebius* * *Alexandrinus* marcheth next after *Origen* whom *Photius* Patriarch of Constantinople, and their owne Authours *Tribemius*, *Possennius*, and others haue left out of their Catalogues. But that we may feigne a dumbe man to speake, what will he say for their Purgatory fire? He talketh of a song of a generall *Requies pro defunctis*, namely, that which hath bene giuen to blessed Saints; but these come not into that fire as * hath bene confessed.

22. The Councell of Nice *Can. 65. Arabico*, is the seventh witnesse. Who will not reuerence the name of so famous a Councell?

* *Senensis* *bibl. l. 5.*
Annot. 171 &
Annot. 230.

* *Suarez* *Ies. Tom*
2. in *Thom qu.*
59. Art. 6. *sect. 1.*

§. Tertia *sententia.*

* *Bellar. l. 2. de*
Purg. c. 1.

* *Coccinius* calleth him *Alexandrinus* *Prefbiter*, *Turrian*, *Episcopus*; but *Baronius* naming vp the *Bishops* of that See, neuer mentions any such *B.* The truth is, they know not what to make him.

* See aboue, *sect. 1. n. 4.*

Councell? But in what Canon shall wee see any mention of the fire of *Purgatory*? In *Can. 65*. But what language? For it is not in the Greeke, or Latine Councils: In the *Arabicke*, saith *Coccinus*. But when came these *Arabicke* Canons into the publicke light? Not (for ought that I can finde) vntill 1500. years after Christ, which afterwards their Iesuit *Turrian* published to the world: But what credite are they of? ^{Because} *our Elders* (saith *Baronius*) seeme to haue beene ignorant of these Canons, at what time the authority of them had beene most necessary, as namely when the Controuersie of *Affrica* was on foot, (meaning that solemne reiecting of Appeals vnto Rome) I leaue these to be discussed rather by some others. This confession of their Cardinall layeth a shrewd suspicion of forge-rie vpon them: And their Bishop ^{*} *Tarraconensis*, speaking to the same point, saith, that the Iesuite *Turrian* could not perswade him, that these are the true Canons of the Councell of *Nice*. We see the zeale that *Coccinus* hath for this Article, who leauing the ordinary Canons of *Nice*, runneth into *Arabia* to seeke for some sparke to kindle a *Purgatory* fire: And yet, when all is done, there is nothing in that Canon but *Fiat Oratio pro eo*, which proueth no more the fire of *Purgatorie*, then that the ^{*} *Blessed soules are purged in that fire*.

^{*} Card. Baron.
Anno 315. n. 180

^{*} Augustinus E-
piscopus Tarra-
conensis de E-
mend. Grat.
Dial. 20.

^{*} See aboue,
sec. 1. n. 7.

24. *Eusebius Casariensis, vita Constant. l. 4. cap. 60. & cap. 71.* [Prayers are made for the soule of the Emperor *Constantine*,] is the eight witnesse: This is the testimony which *Coccinus* vseth for prooue of Romish *Purgatorie*; as though *Eusebius* and the faithfull of those times had thought, that the Soule of that godly Emperour could bee then deteyned in torment of *Purgatorie* fire, before it could ascend into blessednesse. But *Coccinus* himselfe else-where doth both know and acknowledge the confession of *Eusebius*, concerning the soule of *Constantine*, to wit, *When as I thinke* (saith *Eusebius*) *how that his most blessed soule doth enjoy life with God, and that he is honorably muested in immortality of the blessed world, I am surprized with an amazement, and cannot speake*. And againe, *Coccinus* in the same place addeth a second testimony of the same *Eusebius*, out of *Lib. 3. de vita Constant. cap. 45.* where

^{*} *Coccinus* Tom. 1.
l. 5. Art. 2. cyting
Euseb. Casar. out
of his lib. 1. cap.
1. de *Vita Con-*
stant.

it is said of the same *Constantine*, that *His soule being now dissolved from the bands of this flesh, is assumed vnto immortality, and an Angelicall nature, and vnto our Saviour Christ Iesus.* Which testimony of *Ensebius Coccinus* bringeth in to prooue, that *The soules of holy men, after their departure out of this life goe directly into heauen.* Marke now, good Reader, the distorted wit of this *Coccinus*, who in one place instanceth in the *Soule of Constantine*, to shew that soules are detained in a Purgatory torment, before they can ascend vnto blessednes: and yet in another place, singeth out the example of the *Soule* of the same *Constantine*, to proue by the testimony of the same *Ensebius* also, that the *Soules* of holy men are not kept in places of anguish and affliction after their death, but are presently *Assumed* into the kingdome of happinesse: I wish Mr. *Parsons* to looke vnto his *Coccinus*, whom hee hath chosen to be the witnesse of all these witnessles, and let him tell vs whether such kinde of dealers, deserue not to be nayled to the post.

25. The ninth witnesse must bee *Athanas.* *Quest. 34.* which, in the iudgement of their *Sextus Senensis*, seemeth not to be the booke of *Athanasius*, but is, as their Iesuite *Possenn* confesseth, a *Iudas*, that is, *Falsly inscribed Athanasius Coccinus*, belike, was in doubt that this feigned witnesse would be in danger to loose his eares, and therefore he sought to corroborate his sentence with another testimony of *Athanasius*, cited by *Damasen*.

26. The tenth witness is *Damasen. Serm. De defunctis*, citing *Athanasius* out of his booke, *De ijs qui fide dormierunt*: but this witnesse also is one of the Poste, concerning whom *Bellarmino* saith, that *It may be easily proued to be none of the booke of Damasen*. Here againe we see what little credite is to be giuen vnto *Coccinus* in impannelling his Iurie, who will haue a forged booke of *Damasen* to confirme a forged booke of *Athanasius*, and all to defend a forged Purgatory, which may well becomie both *Coccinus* to doe, and Mr. *Parsons* to approue.

The

^a Senens. Biblioth
l. 4. Tit. Athana-
sius.
^b Possenn Ap-
par. Tit. Atha-
nasius.

^c Bellir l. 2. de
Purg. c. 8. §.
Contra hoc, c.
§. Prima quia.

Greeke Fathers abused by Coccius for defence
of Romish Purgatory.

THE SECOND DECADE.

27. The first witnesse following after *Athanasius*, is *Basil*. cap. 4. in *Esaia*, *Qui abluit*, &c. where he telleth vs of a *Reserved tryall and examination*, which shall be made by fire in the life to come: whereinto *Flagitia*, that is, *Criminall finnes* must enter, such as a man doth purposely commit, which must be punished with the fire of iudgement. And againe, In cap. 6. There is a purifying fire. And yet againe, In cap. 9. There is an expurgation, according to that of the *Apostle*. [He shall be saved, yet as it were by fire.] All these testimonies are of the same stampe, therefore that answer, which their owne ^a *Senensis* giueth vnto two places, may satisfie for all three, viz. The speech of *Basil* in *Esa. 4.* vpon these wordes [He shall purge *Hierusalem* in the spirit of iudgement, and in the spirit of heate, &c.] where he saith, that this is referred vnto that triall and examination, which shall be in the world to come, &c. as also his speech vpon *Esa. 9.* saying, that the Prophet sheweth that earthly things must be deliuered *igni punitiuo*, that is, vnto the punishing fire for the good of the soule, &c. These speeches doe seeme (saith *Senensis*) to imply that which the former sentences did, (to wit, the sentences of *Lactantius*, and *Origen*) viz. the fire of conflagration, which shall be in the last day, which, by the confession of *Belarmine* doth nor make for Romish Purgatory.

28. The second is, *Ephraim Orat. aduersus superbiam*. Doost thou consider the fire (saith hee) which we must passe thorow? What fire, throw we, is this he sheweth? in 1. Cor. 3. The day of the Lord will declare euery mans worke, which day shall be renewed by fire. This fire is so plainly the fire of conflagration in the last day of iudgement (and consequently not the Romish Purgatory-fire) that ^c *Belarmine* discussing the meaning of that Scripture [1. Cor. 3. The day of the Lord shall be renewed by fire] saith that *Omnes veteres*, &c. that is, All the auuncient Wri-

^a *Senens. Bibliot.*
l. 5. Annot. 171.
Suarez Tom. 2.
in *Thom. 4.* 59.
art. 6. disp. 37.
sect. 1. §. Ex hac.
doth expound
these places,
De diuino igne,
and not of
Purgatory-fire
^b See aboue,
sect. 1. num. 4.

^c *Belar. l. 1. de*
Purg. c. 4. §.
Tertio quia
Græcus.

Possuin. Ies.
Apparat. Tit.
Ephraim.

ters seeme to vnderstand by this the day of their last iudgment, and their opinion (saith he) herein seemeth vnto me most true. Then may we say that Coccinus his inference from that fire of the last iudgment, to proue a fire of Purgatory, before that day of iudgment, is most false. The second place of Ephraim, Parane. 49. is of the same stampe; onely, *Transitus per ignem*. The last testimony is out of Ephraim his Testament: but read *Trithemius de Illust. Scriptoribus*, and especially the Iesuite *Possuin*, who reckoning almost an hundred Tractats of Ephraim, did omit his Testament.

* See aboue,
sect. I. 24.

29. *Cyrril of Hierusalem* entreth in the second place of this scene, who in *Cateches. 5. mystag.* saith, that Prayer is offered in the dreadfull Sacrifice for the helpe of Soules: which he illustrateth by a similitude of making Supplication for one that is cast into exile, by the displeasure of a King: which sheweth the State of soules in exile, not in a fierie Fornace; & in *pandamni*, and not *Sensus*; it is the not fruition of blessednesse, but yet not the sense of Torment, and therefore concerneth not the Romish Purgatory, as may appeare by the^e second confessed Observation.

† Coccinus The-
saur. Tom. 1. l. 5.
Art. 2.

30. *Greg. Nazianzene* is the fourth of this ranke, who *Orat. 10. in Laudem fratris defuncti*, Prayeth God to receive the soule of his brother *Cesarinus*. This is the onely testimony, which Coccinus produceth out of *Nazianzen*: vpon this kinde of prayer, by M. Parsons and Coccinus his conclusion, we are to beleue that *Nazianzen* thought, that the Soule of that *Cesarinus* might then haue bene in Purgatory torment, and not in heavenly blessednesse: But alas for the crookednesse of contentious spirits! for Coccinus himselfe vseth the very same *Orat. 10. of Nazian. in Laudem fratris Cesarij defuncti*, which is, in praise of his brother *Cesarinus* then departed, to proue a quite contrary conclusion, to wit, that the Soules of the faithfull, after they be departed, doe goe immediately into heauen: Albeit the wordes of *Nazianzen* be in manner of prayer, thus: But thou, O diuine and sacred man, I wish thee to penetrate the heauens, and to rest in the bosome of Abraham, to beholde the Quire of Angels, and the glory of the blessed Saints, &c. Not that

that he doubted of his present blessednes, for in the same Oration he saith thus: *Credo, &c. I beleene that every generous soule is pretious in Gods sight, and, as soone as it departeth out of the body, goeth presently vnto the Lord, and receiveth blessednesse.* Euen as he doth in his next Oration, which hee made in the commendation of his sister *Gorgonia*, then dead: *Equidem non dubio, &c. I doubt not (saith he) but that thou now enioyest the Quire of Angels, and the contemplation of the blessed Trinity, &c.* Which was the so vndoubted doctrine of *Nazianzen*, concerning the soules of all the godly, who depart in the faith of *Christ*, that *Nilus* the Greeke Bishop doth vse a sentence of *Nazianzen*, for the confutation of Romish Purgatorie, viz. *Nazian. Serm. de Pasch.* speaking of the state after this life, saith (saith *Nilus*) *ἡνδραϊκῶν καθάπερ ἴσας*, i. c. *That there is no Purgation.*

*Nilus Episcopus
Thessal. de Purg.
igae.*

31. The fift is, *Gregory Nissen. in Orat. Quod non sit dolendum ob eorum obitum, qui in fide decesserunt*; And li. *de anima*, & *resurrect.* he maketh mention of *Purgatory fire* after this life &c. This witnesse reacheth beyond the Romish Purgatory, and further then the Romanists themselves will allow: for if a Greeke Bishop may be thought fit to vnderstand what was the iudgement of *Greg. Nissene*, concerning the state of the dead, then let vs listen vnto *Nilus*,^h who telleth vs that *Greg. Nissen* seemed to fauour that opinion, which defended *ἀνωτά-^{supra}* *σαων*, that is, a *Redintegration*, which sinners (meaning the damned) shall finde after the ende of their punishment, and calleth that punishment a *Purgatory furnace*: therefore wee answer (saith *Nilus*) that those were the pernicious Comments of certaine Hereticks, who accorded vnto *Origen*, and did to that end abuse that singular light of the Church (viz. *Greg. Nissene*) to make him seeme to be a Patron of their opinion. Secondly we say (saith *Nilus*) that although that holy man (*Greg. Nissene*) did hold that opinion, which being questionable in his time, was afterward condemned by a Councell, yet he is not to be followed in his error; which error was condemned in *Origen*. And that his bookes are not free from such like corruptions, it is herein very credible, because that *Nicephorus*, speaking of

¹ See *Origen* re-
iect by the
Romanists a-
boue §. 3. n. 11
^h *Niceph. Calix-
tus l. 1. c. 19.*

his Booke *De anima*, suspecteth that *Certaine Heretickes had infused some Origenicall opinions into it*. Seeing then that either the witnesse *Niffene* himfelfe was in the errour of *Origen*; or else his Bookes were infected therewith; An erroneous witnesse, may not bee admitted for a competent Author of trueth. For if the blind leade the blind, beware the Ditch. That next place, which they take out of *Damasene*, wee haue seene already nayled vnto the poste for forged stufte.

¹ See aboue
num. 16.

32. *Timotheus Alexandrinus*, cometh in for a sixth witnesse, in his *Resp. Interrog. 14. Oblatio non est facienda super eum, qui sibi mortem intulerit*: But such sentences doe not inferre *Purgatorie*, as^m hath beene proued. The Bookes themselves of *Responsa*, and *Interrog.* heere cited by *Coccinus*; are not admitted by their Iesuite ⁿ *Possennius*, who bringeth in *Gennadius* to report, that this *Timotheus was condemned by the Councell of Calcedon, and to haue beene exiled for an Hereticke*; What dealing is this of our Aduersaries, to obiekt him, whom they themselves doe reiekt?

^m See aboue,
sect. 1. num. 7.

ⁿ *Apparat. Tit.*
Timo. Alexan.

33. *Epiphanius* approacheth in seventh place to yeelde his testimonie, who saith nothing but *Prodesse orationes mortuis*, which (as^o hath beene prooued) containe not in them any sparke of tormenting fire. Besides, it may concerne our Aduersaries to examine this witnesse more strictly, least whilst they labour to draw from him their pretended trueth, they draw vpon themselves an error condemned by the practise of the Church (which is to pray for the mitigation of the paine of the damned, with whom we haue no communion) because ^p *Epiphanius*, albeit hee accounted *Origen* after his death an *Hereticke, and an enemy of the Church, by whose doctrine some were made meate for the Diuell*, yet did hee pray that ^q *God would pardon him*.

^p *Epiph. Epist. ad*
Job. Hieros.

^q *Epiphani. lib.*
Anchorat. p. 347

34. *Chrysostome*, being the eighth witnesse, is hayled in by the heeles to speake nothing to the purpose: For either his speeches may signifie onely *Prayer for the dead*, which doeth not necessarily inferre any *Purgatorie* torment; or *Prayer* for them who are in ioye, which confuteth *Purgatorie*; or else *Prayer* for them, who died in their sinnes, in the state of damnation,

nation, which is farre beyond Romish Purgatorie; and which kind of *Prayer* our Aduersaries themselues doe thinke to bee transgressions, rather then deuotions. These we shall shew by examining the seuerall particulars in order.

35. The first, *Hom. 5. de Sacerdotio. cap. 4.* He speaketh of *Prayers, for the sinnes of all both quick and dead.* Whereas (according to our former *Observations*) Prayer for remission of sinnes may haue diuers respects, besides the deliuerance out of the torment of *Purgatorie fire* immediately after death, as namely, remission from *Pœna damni* onely; or from the *Iudgement of Examination*, which is not of purgation; or if of sense, yet of that which is the *Fire of conflagration* in the body at the last day, and not presently and lingeringly after death.

36. The second, *Hom. 32. Why dost thou intreate the Priests to pray for the dead? I know thou wilt answer, that thou dost so, that he may obtaine rest, and finde the Iudge mercifull vnto him.* But if *Coccius* had had the leisure to haue stepped but one foot further to the words next following, hee should haue seene *Chrysostome* confute his Inference, As thus: *Dost thou therefore weepe and crye? Dost thou not see how contrarie thou art to thy selfe? For seeing thou thinkest that the Soule departed is gone into flourishing and delightfull Meadows, why dost thou raise vp such tempests,* meaning, of teares? Will M. Parsons iudge that this place can proue a *Purgatorie* torment? Will he erect a fierie Fornace vpon flourishing meadowes?

37. In the rest of the testimonies wee may obserue that which *Senensis* obserued in *Hom. 33. in Matth. & Chrysostome* *Senensis Bibliotheca.* (saith he) may seeme to haue fallen, after a sort, into the opinion of lib. 6. Annot. 47. them, who thought that Prayer for the dead might profit the very damned. We say more, that he doeth more then seeme to haue beene of that opinion, as the places themselues, which *Coccius* hath pointed at, doe easily bewray: For *Hom. 16. in Iob.* The partie, whom *Almes* and *Oblations* are said to profit after death, is called a *Sinner*, and such a sinner, as *Did* often offend God; and such an offender as did transgresse in malice, therefore he saith: *His malice is cut off by death, but the iust is placed*

placed in safetie, and freed from future feare. And *Hom. 21. in Act. Apost.* Wishing to Diminish the punishment of the dead, he describeth such a dead partie, as spent the most part of his life vainely, serving sinne and the diuell.

38. In *Hom. 41. in 1. Cor.* There is, we confesse, the approbation of Prayer for soules, that they may receive some comfort: But what kind of Soules they bee, the place doeth manifest, where *Chrysostome* diuideth them onely into two Orders, *Them who lined well in this life, and them who lined ill:* And the Sinner, for whom the Prayers are required, was such an one, *Who had power (namely in his life) to expiate his sins, and would not;* and who by death *Was hindred, lest he should multiply finnes.* Like as is more plainly manifested in the next place, In *Epist. ad Philipp. Sermon. 3. Moral.* Where he telleth vs, that much profit redoundeth vnto the dead by our Prayers for sinners departed: But, will you know what colour these Sinners were of, verily as blacke as Murrians, for they were such, in *Chrysostome* his estimate, *Who dying in the abundance of riches, which in their life time they neuer used for the comfort of their soules.* And the last place, *Hom. 69. ad Pop. Antioch.* doeth not differ from the rest. I aske therefore, with what conscience doe our Aduersaries cite these testimonies, which (because they are erroneous) they themselues will not iustifie and imbrace.

39. *Palladius Hist. Lausiaca. cap. 40.* Possesseth the ninth place, but (as if *Pallidus* were his name) being afraid to bee knowne; and no maruell, seeing that their Iesuite *Possenuine* doubteth not to say of him, that he was spotted with *Origenicall impieties.* The same *Palladius* (who writ the *Historia Lausiaca*) their Cardinall *Baronius* prouoeth, both out of *S. Hierom,* and *Epaphanius,* to haue rotted in the contagious heresie of *Origen, &c.* which *Baronius* further collecteth out of that *Historia Lausiaca,* which are the Bookes of *Palladius,* which *Coccinius* here produceth for prooofe of their *Purgatorie.* Which may disable the credit of *Coccinius,* who in impannelling the Iurie, could make no better choise.

40. *Synesius, Epist. 44.* is the last of this Decade, in whom there

† *Possenuine. Apparat. Tit. Palladius.*

‡ *Baron. An. 388.*

num. 103. & 107

¶ *Anno 400.*

num. 61.

there is no mention of Prayer for the dead, nor yet of any paine after death, excepting that which is *pena immortalis*; That is, *eternal*: But our Aduerfaries dreame not of any other Purgatorie paine, but that which is *Temporall*: And thus much of these ten witnesses. I referre vnto the iudgement of my Reader, to discerne, whether they bee not either counterfeite, or Apocryphall, or corrupt, or else violently vtged beyond their proper aime.

Witnesses among the Greeke Fathers, abused by Coccius, for defence of Romish Purgatorie.

THE LAST DECADE.

41. *Atticus Patriarcha Constantinop. Epist. ad Cyrillum Alexand.* Here is a solemne Preface, what will this first witness say? There is mention to be made of Bishops departed, &c. at the time of the Communion, on the mysticall Table. But we haue obserued from our Aduerfaries, that Commemoration doeth not inferre any Supplication, nor yet Supplication any tormenting purgation.

^a See above, sect. 1. num. 7. and more fully hereafter, num. 47. and 48.

42. *Iohannes Casianus, Collat. 2. cap. 5.* is called vpon by Coccinus to speake for Purgatorie: But he may not bee admitted into the number of witnesses, because he hath long since bene impeached of falshood by Pope *Gelasius*, who reckoneth this Booke among the *Apocrypha writings*, which is a thing that their Card. *Baronius* will haue vs obserue: ^c See (saith he) the censure of *Gelasius*, wherein the same workes of *Casianus* (speaking of the Collations here mentioned by Coccinus) are reiected, as being no way Catholicke. Yet are not Coccinus, and his assistant M. Parsons, ashamed to shake this Knight by the hand, and to make him one of their choyse witnesses.

^b *Gratian. Dist. 15.*
^c *Baron. Anno. 433 num. 30.*

43. In the third place, *Socrates* steppeth forward, in his *Lib. 7. Hist. cap. 25.* to tell vs how^a that In solemne Prayers there was mention made of Bishops after their departure. But I demand of M. Parsons, how often hee hath heard mention made of the names of Holy men and women departed out of

^a See this largely confuted hereafter by their owne confessions. num. 47. and num 48.

this life at *S. Pauls Croſſe*, and elſewhere by our Preachers of *England*, in their Prayers of thankſgiuing for their former grace, and preſent ioy; and not as of requeſts to free them from any Purgatory torment? Yet ſo it is, *Socrates* muſt ſerue their turne to fill vp a number.

44. But what ſhall we ſay to *Theodore*t? Hee firſt (*Lib. 5. Hiſt. cap. 36.*) recordeth the Act of *Theodoſius*, who prayeth to God to pardon the iniuries, which his Parents had committed of ignorance. Wee reade that *Iſaacke* ſaid vnto *Abraham*, * *Father, behold the ſier and the wood, but where is the Lambe for the burnt offering?* I may inuert the ſpeech and ſay, here is the Sacrifice of Prayer, but where is the ſire, for we haue already ^d prooued, that Prayer for remiſſion doth not neceſſarily inferre any Purgatorie torment. The ſecond place alreadie out of *Theodore*t is *Hiſt. Sanct. Patrum de Iacobo Niſſibita*: But this is not found in their * *Poſſenine*, among the workes of *Theodore*t. The third place is noted to be in *1. Cor. 3. Quicquid intenuit, &c.* Which words (as ^f *Coccinus* himſelfe confeſſeth) being cited by *Aquinas* (for Purgatorie) are not now found either in the Greeke or Latine Copies of *Theodore*t. May we not then iudge them worthy the poſt? No doubtleſſe ſaith *Coccinus*; for Marke (for he will giue vs a reaſon) the words were raſed out (ſaith he) by ſome Greeke ſhones, who miſliked Purgatorie. If this were ſenſible, then the Latines likewiſe miſliked Purgatorie, for the Sentence (ſaith *Coccinus*) is not now found in the Latine Tranſlations of *Theodore*t: So that *M. Parſons* is to make his choiſe, whether hee will confeſſe that one Sentence of *Theodore*t to bee forged, for prooſe of Purgatorie, or elſe both the Greeke and Latine Churches, to haue bene falſe Registers of the Bookes of *Theodore*t.

45. The fiſt Authour is *Baſilius Selencius, Conc. de Exſuſcit. Lazari*, ſpeaking of Sacrifice offered for thoſe, who offended God in many things; vſing the ſame ſtraine of ſpeech as *Chryſoſtome* had done, by extending Prayer vnto the ſoules of grieuous and mortall offenders. Which doctrine the ſtomacke of the Purgatorians will in no wiſe diſgeſt.

46. What will become of the teſtimonie of their ſixt writ-
neſſe,

* *Gene. 22. 7.*

^d See aboue,
ſect 1. num. 7.

* *Poſſenine. 1. ef.*
Apparat. Tit.
*Theodore*tus.
^f *Coccinus*, in the
place objected

^e See aboue,
ſ. 3. num. 37.

ness, whom *Coccinus* nameth *Diadochus*, de perfectione Spirit. cap. 100? All that he will say, is that *Men* fearing death a little, enter, as it were, into iudgement to be Examined by the fire of iudgement, &c. But their Cardinall *Bellarmino*^b hath told vs already that this fire doeth differ from the fire of *Purgatorie*: For the fier of Iudgement is but a Trying and examining fire; and that fire of *Purgatorie* is a purging and tormenting fire.

^b See above, sect. 1. num. 5.

47. But now let every man giue roome, for two Emperors doe approach, and seeme to offer their testimonies for *Purgatorie*: The first is, *Iustinus Imp. Epist. ad Hormisdam*, who saith; *That we may not contemne all the memories of the dead*, That is: The Commemorations of their names, as their Cardinallⁱ *Baronius* teacheth, shewing that heereby was meant the tollerating of the mention of the names of some in the Catalogue of orthodoxall Bishops, who died in the schisme of *Acatius*. Now if Commemorations of Bishops and Saints departed, doe necessarily conclude them to be in *Purgatorie* fire, then^k how shall wee celebrate the names of *Patriarkes*, *Prophets*, *Apostles*, *Martyrs*, yea and of the glorious vessell of Grace, the *Virgine Marie*, to praise God that they are in rest and blessednesse? What iniurie will not these *Purgatorians* doe vnto other Authors, who dare offer such violence vnto the sentence of so great an Emperour?

ⁱ *Baronius Anno* 520. num. 53. & 54. making the subiect of the Letters of *Iustinus*, and of *Iustinianus* the same: Nowe num. 34. hee sheweth the cause, as I haue related.
^k See above sect. 1. num. 4. and sect. 2. num. 13.

48. The nex Emperour is *Iustinianus*, *Nonellà de Monachis*. Hee is also without due reuerence thrust in, and vrged to speake nothing to the purpose, saying onely that *There are Funerals performed for the dead, which are called their Memorials*. To what end is this? Let M. Parsons stretch this out with his teeth as farre as he can, yet shall hee not possibly make *Memorials of the dead*, reach so farre as the *Purgatorie* fire, for the afflicting of their soules as hath beene shewen, and will be^{*} hereafter more apparant.

^{*} See in the Section following.

49. *Procopius Gazens*, *Ad cap. 6. Esaia* is the ninth Author, vpon whom M. Parsons must serue a *Latitat*, before he will appeare: For their *Sixtus Senensis*, speaking of these

¹ Sixtus Senenf.
Biblloth. lib. 4.

Commentaries, saith that ¹ *They haue not as yet beene turned into Latine, but are kept in the Venetian Librarie.* And when he is suffered to speake the best that he can, it is no more but this, that *There is a celestiall place of Purgation of mens soules, euen by the Seraphims.* This celestiall and heavenly *Purgatorie* must needs be spirituall, by the force of the Holy Ghost, and not by any hellish torment; but differeth as much from the reall fire, which is our Aduersaries fornice, as doth *Heauen* from *Hell*.

50. The tenth and last man of their Greeke witneses is *Iohannes Climachus*, (who liued about the yeere 580.) *Gradu. 4. de Insomnijs.* All that the testimonie hath, is but the *Celebration of seruice for the sleeping of ones soule*: which doth make no more for *Purgatorie*, then to pray that the soule of him that sleepeth may, in the end, be ioyned with the body, and made partaker of the consummation of blisse.

^m See aboue,
sect. 1. num. 4.

51. Because M. *Parsons* in his *Challenge* hath allotted vnto me but the compasse of sixe hundred yeares, I will not transgresse, to proceede in discouering many base counterfeits and corrupt Authours, whom *Coccins* hath brought to serue his slage. I now desire the Christian Reader to ponder and apply the *Observations* and Grants of our Romish Aduersaries, noted ^m aboue in the first Section, & to apply the allegations of *Coccins* vnto them, and (seeing that M. *Parsons* did earnestly desire that I should demonstrate the abuse of one and thirtie Fathers, whether Greeke or Latine, within the compasse of sixe hundred yeeres after *Christ*) to trie whether I haue not satisfied him already, euen in the Greeke Authors, for besides the ten Greeke *Liturgies*, we haue found Greeke Authors (if we shall admit *Damasen* for one, who fell in *orbit* into *Coccins* his Catalogue) thrice Ten, which by being examined, according to the confessed principles, conclusions, animaduersions, and obseruations of our Aduersaries themselves, appeare to be either foysted, or corrupted, or discredited, or wrested, to prooue that which cannot bee euinced from them, which wee may so much the rather suspect, because that their owne Bishop ⁿ *Roffensis* went so farre in his time,

ⁿ *Roffensis, Ant.*
18. *Con. Lib.*

time, as to confesse that *There was none or very rare mention of Purgatory in the Greeke Fathers*; and that the doctrine thereof was hardly knowne in those times: and more absolutely their • *Polydore Virgil* graunting that *It was not acknowledged by the Grecians vnto this day*. VVhich sheweth that their *Salmeron* and *Coccins*, in alleaging more then all the *Greeke Fathers*, for prooffe of that doctrine, haue done this with a *Greekish* (according to the Prouerb) with a deceiueable faith. Thus much of the *Greeke Fathers*.

S E C T. IIII.

The testimonies deliuered in the name of the Latine Fathers, abused by Coccins, for prooffe of Purgatory.

52. **T**His booke groweth bigge and corpulent; if I should deale as particularly in the *Latine*, as I haue done in the *Greeke* Testimonies, I might complaine of an — *Amphora exiit*: therefore will I insift onely vpon those allegations, which may be best satisfied from the principles of our Aduersaries; and leaue the rest, remitting my Reader to the Consultations which other Protestants, haue yeelded vnto them.

53. *Tertullian* is made the Captaine of this band, whom • some of our Aduersaries haue noted to haue held, that the soules are in sequestred receptacles, wherein they neyther receiue paine, nor their reward of blessednesse; which doctrine (in the iudgement of their Iesuite *Suarez*) doth consequently gaine say the doctrine of *Purgatory* fire. And this answer in generall, might satisfie their particular objections out of *Tertullian*; notwithstanding we shall examine these.

54. The first is, *De testimonio animæ, aduersus Gentes, cap. 4.* Thou prayest for the bones and ashes of the dead, that they may haue refreshing, and wishest that he (the departed) may rest well with them, who are apud inferos. The party whom *Tertullian* bringeth in praying thus, is not a Christian, but a Pagan, and

the purpose which *Tert.* hath to alleadge that, and other opinions of the Heathen, was not to approue them, but to proue out of them that there is an *Immortality of the soule*, euen as he doth from another absurd opinion of theirs, in calling wicked men *diuels*, and thereby confessing that there is a *Diuell*, and consequently a *Tormenter*, and therefore also a *Day of iudgement*. Concerning the truth of this answer, my Reader may consult with their owne *Renatus Laurentius* in his *Argument*, and *Annotations* vpon this booke.

55. The second, *Tert. de corona militis, ca. 3. We make Oblations for the dead*; and (this parte *Coccinus* hath cut off) for their birth-dates. Must *Oblations for the dead* once a yeare necessarily imply a *Purgatory torment*? or wil our aduerfaries allow the whole testimony of *Tertullian*? Neither of both: for their ^b *Renatus* answering vnto places of *S. Cyprian. l. 3. cap. 6. & l. 4. cap. 5.* That saying of *Cyprian* (saith he) that *Oblations are offered for Martyrs, if I be not deceiued, signifieth the commemorations, and remembrance of them according to the custome of those times, which was, after the repeating of the Creede, to give up the names of godly men departed, in a scrowle, to lay it on the Altar there, to be recyted not without some praise and commendations of their vertues, which shined in them, whilst they were alive.* What can be more plaine to infringe the necessity of this consequence, which is, from *Oblations for them* to infer a *Purgatory punishment and torment* of them? That which *Tertullian* addeth concerning the yearly celebrations of their *Birth-dates*, Was (as both ^c *Rhenanus* and ^d *Rhenatus* acknowledged) an *Heathenish custome*, and for a time onely by indulgence tolerated in the Church, but afterwards condemned by the *Councell of Nice*.

56. The third, *De anima, cap. vlt.* speaking of a little offence, which (as the vttermost farthing) must be paid in that morall resurrectionis, That is, in the time of the delay of the Resurrection: *Coccinus* should haue considered that *Tertullian* is reckoned by their ^e owne Doctores among the erroneous *Chiliassts*, who held that the Saints should liue a Thousand yeares in this world in all spiritmall delights, at what time men should rise (as

Ribera

^b *Renatus Laurent. Annot. in Tert. l. ad Martyres.*
Oblations and Commemorations.

^c *Rhenanus Arg. in Tert. de corona.*

^d *Renatus vpon the place it selfe.*

^e *Senen. bibl. l. 6. Annot. vlt. & l. 5. Annot. 233. & Ribera. l. 1. in Apoc. 20. ver. 4.*

Ribera expoundeth them) according to their merits, some sooner then others. Therefore if we take [*Mora resurrectionis*,] in the last day, for lingring and delay in the time of their resurrection, this, we see, is twelue score wide of Romish Purgatorie.

57. The fourth, *De Monogamia*, cap. 11. & *De castitate* cap. 11. are bookes which both ^f Pammelius and ^g Possennius confesse to haue beene written when he was a *Montanist*, euen against the Church. And the testimonies themselues talking but of *Prayers* and *Oblations*, and *refreshing*, will not carry leuell to the scope that *Coccius* aymeth at, as by many exam-
ples we haue proued.

^f Pammelius &
Rhenanus in
Tert.
^g Possennius Ies.
Apparat.

58. The next Authour, concerning whom I may haue some direction from our Aduersaries, is *Zeno Veronensis*, in whose testimony, *In Serm. de Resurrect.* there is no mention eyther of *Fire* or of *Purgatory*. And the booke it selfe is of so small credite, that their Notaries of auncient writings, viz. *Trithemius*, *Senensis*, *Possennius*, *Baronius*, and others, doe not so much as touchase this Author the naming.

59. The third is *Lactantius*, lib. 7. *Institu.* cap. 21. *Perstringentur*, &c. That is, God wil examine the iust with fire, and the sinnes of men shal be burned. Which testimony also *Bellarmino* vrgeth to prooue their Purgatory fire after death, not considering that *Lactantius* speaketh (as their Iesuited ^h Suarez confesseth) of the fire in the day of the resurrection; Which is (saith their ⁱ *Senensis*) the fire of conflagration in the last day; Which is not (saith ^k *Bellarmino*) that Purgatory, now contronerted. And ^l *Suarez* doth furthermore call this a false erroneous opinion, so thinke that there shall be some iust men in the day of the resurrection, who being not perfectly purged of their sinnes, must be ioyned to their bodies, and so purged with fire in their bodies and soules, before that they can be blessed.

^h Suar. Ies. Tom. 2. in Thom. q. 59. Disp. 57. sect. 1. §. Tertia sententia.
ⁱ Senens. bibl. 1. §. Annot. 171.
^k Bellar. see a boue.
^l Suarez. Tom. 2. in Thom. disp. 57. sect. 1. §. Veruntamen.

60. *Hilarius Pictaviensis* in *Psal.* 59. where he speaketh of purging of sinnes with fire, alluding vnto that of 1. Cor. 3. of many That shall be saved, as it were by fire, according as elsewhere, *In Psal.* 118. vpon those wordes [My soule hath desired thy iudgements,] We (saith he) must passe thorow that indefatigable

^l Bellar. l. i. de
Purg. c. 6. ad
finem.

^m Bellar. l. 2. de
Purg. c. 1. §.
Adde.

ⁿ Senens. bibl. l. 5
Annot. 171. §.
Hilarius vnā.
• Bellar. quo. sup.
§. Hec sen
tentia.

ble fire, wherein we must undergoe those grieuous punishments, for the expiation of the finnes of our soules, and is objected by ^l Bellarmine for confirmation of Romish Purgatorie: notwithstanding the same Bellarmine repeating the same place of Hilary in Psal. 118. vpon the same text, [*My soule hath desired thy iudgements, &c.* where Hilary saith, that *All* (except Christ) yea, the Virgine Mary must passe thorow the fire, ^m sheweth that Hilary seemeth not to meane the Purgatory fire, but the fire of Gods iudgement, thorow which indeede all Saints must passe. And their ⁿ Senensis will haue vs vnderstand that herein Hilarius followed the opinion of Origen, who taught that all, except Christ, must passe thorow the fire of conflagration at the last day: which opinion • Bellarmine condemneth for a manifest error.

61. S. ^e Ambrose his worthinesse mooued Coccinus to be plentifull in alleadging diuers testimonies out of him: but (if I be not much deceiued) very vnfortunately. The first place is his *Orat. de exitu vite Theodosij*, praying thus: *Thou Lord gine perfect rest vnto thy seruant Theodosius, let his soule come where it may not feele the sense of death.* What then? did Ambrose thinke that the soule of this godly Emperour was now in a Purgatory fire? This is indeede, Coccinus his ayme, and M. Parsons his consequence, but behold (good Reader) the vertigo of these men, for in the beginning of that Oration Ambrose professeth publicquely of Theodosius, that *He hath not lost his Kingdome, but changed it, being assumed into the Tabernacles of Christ*: which testimony destroyeth Purgatorie. What then meant Ambrose (will some say) by this Prayer for Theodosius after his death? surely nothing, but as he meant in praying for other Emperors Gratian and Valentinian, which was (as their ^p Iesuite Salmeron confesseth) *To pray for their speedie resurrection.*

^r Salmeron lib. 1
in p. 212. 3. Coment
Epist. Pauli, disp.
6 §. Est ergo.

62. A second place is *Epist. 8. ad Faustinum*, wherein there is onely Prayer for the soule departed: which breth (as wee haue heard) is not stronge enough to kindle a Purgatorie fire.

63. We descend vnto a third testimonie, which is *Orat. 1. pre-*

preparans ad Missam: Which I iudge (saith Erasmus) to be none of the Writings of Ambrose: and therefore we may dis-
 miss it for a *supra scriptum*. Neuerthelesse the testimony it
 selfe cannot euince the Romish Purgatory, as may appeare by
 comparing it with the *third obseruation.

64. The last place is the *Authour of the Comments vpon*
S. Pauls Epistles, which passe vnder the name of Ambrose, teach-
 ing that *A man must suffer a purging fire, lest that hee be tor-*
mented in the fire eternall: but hee telleth not what purging
 fire he meaneth, whether the fire of the spirite, or the fire of
 tribulation in this life, or the fire of examination, or the fire of
 conflagration (as he meaneth in *Psalm*. 118. by the confession of
 **Senensis*) by all which the Romish Purgatorie is excluded.
 And although *Coccinus* could fashion his owne meaning out
 of that place, yet may it be as lawfull for vs to answer in this
 case, according vnto the iudgement of their Iesuite *Salmeron*,
 who proueth those Comments by many Arguments to bee
 none of *S. Ambroses*: Which (as he censureth) are infected
 with the errors of the *Pelagians*.

65. *Prudentius in Hamert*. in his verses prayeth that *A*
light kinde of fire may burne him, and not the eternal: which he
 might do, vnderstanding other fire, besides the Romish Pur-
 gatorie. But the same *Prudentius* in his verses saith, that the
 damned Ghosts haue sometimes *penarum sub styge ferias*,
 That is, *Play-dayes and remissions from the paines of hell*: ther-
 fore could *Bellarmino* say no lesse, but that *Prudentius* did
 herein play the Poet. And so say we, *Termes of Poësie* do not
 alwaies besit the *Virgine Theologie*.

66. *Hierome cap. 66. in Esa. e* As we beleene all torments of
 them, that denie God to be eternall, so doe wee thinke that the
 sentence of the Iudge, will be moderate and mixed with clemen-
 tie against the vngodly Christians, whose workes must be purged
 with fire. And againe, In *Cap. 7. Michæ*: The soule, after that
 it hath indured torments, and is deliuered out of darkenesse, vpon
 the payment of the last farthing, I shall see the iustice of the
 Lord. *S. Hierome* vpon those wordes of the Prophet *Amos*,
cap. 3. Behold he will call fire vnto iudgement, and will deuoure

* *Epist. Erasmi*
ad Lectore, initio
Tom. 4. operum
Ambrosij. And
albeit he
seeme com-
mendable vn-
to Erasmus, yet
not knowing
what age he
was off, he can
challenge no
place here.

* See aboute,
 num. 5.

* *Senens. bibl. l. 5.*
Annot. 171.

* *Salmeron Ies.*
Comment in Epi.
Pauli in genere
disp. 19. p. 61, 62.
&c.

* *Bellarmin. lib. 2.*
de Purg. cap. 18.
 § *Ad quintum.*

Senens. lib. 1. 5
Annot. 171.

the depth, and also eat up a part,] Saith thus (saith Senensis :) The fire doth deuoure all kinde of finnes, as wood Scrubbe, Hay, and afterward, doth eat up part] that is, it seazeth vpon the Saints, who are the peculiar people of God, for it is time that iudgement begin at Gods house: if any mans worke burne, hee shall haue a losse, but he himselfe shall bee safe, yet so as by fire: when as we shall all be in sinne, and stand before the trumh of iudgment, God will haue mercie vpon vs, and raise vs in the time of resurrection. VVhich Sentence Senensis expoundeth of the fire of Conflagration: and other purgation of fire, then this, wee finde not in S. Hierome.

67. The other place is out of Hieroms in cap. 1. Nahum. He indeede compareth Temporall punishment with eternall, but they are the temporall in this life, such as the punishment of the man who gathered stickes (for this is one example) and not of the Romish Temporall punishment in Purgatory.

u Sommi^o Epist.
before Rufinus
vpon the
Psalmes.
x Possenine Jes.
Apparat.

68. Rufinus Ad Psal. 37. who liued Anno 390. and is alleaged out of a Comment vpon the Psalmes, which (for ought that doth appeare in their owne u Sommi^o, or by their Iesuite x Possenine) came not into publique Print, before the yeare 1570. which may serue for a note of an Apocrypha booke.

y Bayon. Ano.
43. Iun. 1598.

69. The next Allegation of Coccinus, which may be controlled by our aduersaries confessions, is out of Paulinus Noldinus his Epist. 18. & Epist. 19. We demaund some euidence for the antiquity of these Epistles, Card. y Baronius aunswereth, that They were preserved by the industry of S. Amandus a Bishop: But what apparance haue they for this? The Epistle (saith he) of Paulinus written vnto Amandus: But how shall we know this? This (saith he) is in the Vatican-Index, and hath not as yet beene put in Print: That is, as wee may lawfully interpret it, these Epistles ascribed vnto Paulinus, are but Apocryphal. That which is further drawne out of the Paraphrasis of Paulinus in Psal. 1. speaketh of The fire which tryeth the worke, which Bellarmine hath distinguished from his Purgatory fire, because this Trieth the worker.

70. Pope Sixtus De malis doctoribus & operibus fidei (which Coccinus

Coccinus calleth *Sixtus tertius* : but *Possennine* sheweth to haue beene *Sixtus secundus* Our apparitor *Coccinus* calleth into the Court to beare witness for *Purgatory* : but hee no sooner appeareth : but their Iesuite *Possennine* dooth pull off his Vi- zard, and findeth him to be a counterfeite, lurking vnder the name of that holy Pope. There were (saith *Possennine*) three vo- lumes of *Pelagians* written in the name of Pope *Sixtus*, the se- cond of them was *De malis Doctoribus & operib⁹ fidei*, which *Baronius* obserueth to be fraught with *Pelagianisme*, whereof *Lindane* hath complained. And thus we see also *Coccinus* yn- masked in his allegation of Pope *Sixtus*, for still hee abuseth his Reader with the *Aequiuocating* names of false Authours. But what else may we expect from *Aequiuocators*?

² *Possennine* Ies.
Apparat. Tit.
Sixtus secundus.

71. *Sedult²* vpon 1. Cor. 3. saith that *S. Paul* did compare the ex- amination of indgement unto fire, because it shal be proued in the *Purgatory* fire of indgement. But if we aske their *Suarez* how we may call Examination a fire, ^a he will informe vs that it is so to be vnderstood as is that of *Dan. 7.* [A flood of fire went out at his mouth] which was the indgement of God, and signifieth nothing but that sentence which *Christ* shall pronounce, which like a fierce fire shall separate and discern the wicked from the good. If then this signifie nothing but the sentence, how can it argue any *Purgatory* punishment?

^a *Suarez* Ies.
Tom. 2. in Thom.
disp. 57. sect. 1.
§. Circa pri-
mum.

72. *Casarius Arelatenfis*, vpon 1. Cor. 3. viz. He shall be safe, yet as it were by fire, distinguisheth betweene the ^b *perpetua pe- na*, and *pena Purgatoria*. And although he talke of *Purgato- ry* punishments, by tribulations in this life, yet that which is here mentioned, is a *Purgatory* fire after death; but when? not vntill the last day of Resurrection; which as it doth not dis- proue, so it doth not prouue the *Romish* *Purgatory* fire, as hath been confessed. That he meant the Fire of the day of the Last Resurrection, it is not denied by *Suarez*, by whom he is reprehended as *Erroneous* for holding, that *Some* sinles, which are not sufficiently purged before the resurrection, shall in that day be purged with that fire. Not to stand vpon the disabling of this witness, to proue him *Apocryphall*.

^b Which word is in *Casarius*, in the Edition set forth by *Bigne* in his *biblioth. S. Patrum*, Tom. 7.

^c *Suarez* Iesuista
Tom. 2. disp. 57.
sect. 1. §. Tertia
sententia, &
§. Veruntamen

73. It were but expence of time to prosecute other Alle-

gations, which *Coccinus* hath pyled vp as Billits, to vse for the making their pretended Romish *Purgatory* fire to burne more bright, wherein there is onely eyther praying for their peace, as in *Arnobius lib. 4. contra Gentes*, or only Oblations or Prayers for the dead, as that of *Bacchiarius*, *De recip. Lapsis*; and *Victor Vicens. de persecutione Vandalica*; and *Martin^o Bracarenfis. de Græcorum Synodis. cap. 69.* and *Conc. Carthag. cap. 79.* or the publicke remembrances, commemorations, and Memorials of some in their publicke prayers, in testimony of the faith of those seruants of God, and thankesfulnesse vnto God, as *Conc. Carthag. 3. cap. 29.* and *Conc. Vafens. cap. 2.* and *Conc. Valentini Hispania. cap. 4.* All which in an orthodoxal sense haue bin applied (as we haue seene) vnto Martyrs and other Saints of blessednesse, who are many thousand miles separated from all breath and sent of that fierie forname of their *Purgatory*: which their *Coccinus*, according to his common errour aymeth at, who will not be found excusable in his last two witnessess.

74. The second Councell of *Arles. cap. 15.* decreeing that The Oblations of the dead should be receiued, except they were knowne to haue murdered themselues. Concerning these kinde of Oblations, we read in more auncient Canons, as *Can. 3. & 4.* of the *Apostles*, wherein it was ordained, as ^a *Binus* expoundeth them, that No Oblations should bee receiued of the Church from any departed, except they had in their life-time professed the Catholicke faith, and liued a godly life. And in the Councell ^e *Vasatense. 1. cap. 1.* it was decreede, that *Whosoener did withdraw from the Church the oblations of the dead, they should be separated from the Church as Infidels.* In these we see Oblations of the dead, which they by their Willes and Testaments left to the Church, to bee bestowed in charitable vses, which *Coccinus* alleadgeth for prooffe of Oblations for the dead, to inferre that loose and dissolute Consequence for the state of such soules in a fierie *Purgatory*. And are not the holy and glorious Saints much beholden vnto *Coccinus*, who from their Oblations of Charity must likewise conclude, that they are in affliction and torment?

^a *Binus Annot.*
in eos Canones.

^e *Apud Binium*
part. 1. col. 460.


75. *Primasius* is the last witnesse, whom I finde within the precincts of the first sixe hundred yeares, and he lib. 5. in *Apoc.* 19. speaking of *Martyrs*, saith of them (as of others) that *The soules of the godly, who are departed, are not now separated from the Church, which is the Kingdome of Christ: otherwise (saith Primasius) we should not at the Altar have a remembrance of them in the communion of the Lords Bodie.* Now all the Romanists doe, together with vs, professe to the glorie of Gods grace, that *Martyrs* and holy *Saints* are in the *Tabernacles* of rest and blessednesse, where there is no *Teares*, but all ioyfull songs of *Alleluiah*: whom notwithstanding wee beleue to be ioyned with vs by a spirituall Communion, we praying God for their holines in their life-time, and for their happinesse after death, as they likewise in generall doe pray and praise God for the Elect. Therefore it cannot be, but *M. Parsons* himselfe wil be offended with his Apparitor *Coccinus*, who vseth no other sentence out of *Primasius*, to prooue that some soules are in the fire of *Purgatorie*, sauing that whereby it must necessarily follow, that *Martyrs* and the Inhabitants of *Paradise* are in miserie.

76. Thus haue I (as I hope) abundantly performed my Taske, offering vnto *Mr. Parsons*, our fierce *Challenger*, his choise of aboue fiftie Testimonies in all, to take out one and thirty Instances of abuses of Fathers, vsed for the prooofe of their *Purgatory*: To the satisfying of his *Earnest Appetite* from the confessed Observations, Principles, and Conclusions of our aduersaries themselues: and yet I did not examine all the fixtie. This Combat being ended, I returne to my *Encounter* with *M. Parsons*.

CHAP. XII.

The falshoods, wherewith M. Parsons hath beene charged in my Preamble (part whereof followeth in the thirteenth Chapter) and his defence thereupon in his Reckoning.

SECT. I.

1.  E hath beene deeply charged with grosse vntuethes, and yet doeth insert himselfe in the Catalogue of *sincere writers*.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning, and profession of sinceritie.

Reckon. p. 214.

I Say for my selfe, if hee haue found thrice three palpable falsities, such as cannot be excused by any ouersight, and error, but such as must needs be iudged malicious and wittingly vntueth, I doe not desire any pardon or relaxation from my first promise, that I be neuer credited more; yea if it be but thrice, which is the measure that I offered vnto others. Hitherto we haue seene no one alleadged and prooued: and truly I do confesse, that if I did perswade my selfe, or doubt that M. *Morton* or any other could prooue any such one vntueth vttered by me, I should be much troubled in Conscience therewith: But for that I am sure I neuer had such meaning, I stand very confident, that he will neuer bee able to bring any one example, and much lesse thrice three.

The Reueiwe.

2. If that M. *Parsons* bee an honest man, then his fellow Priest hath played no honest mans part, who hath branded him in the forehead, with singular markes of *Forgeries and Lies*. Neuerthelesse, I stand not vpon his Conscience, but contend by due prooffe to lay open his foule spots of falsifications, formerly objected against him in my *Preamble*, which in this *Reckoning* he laboureth to wash off, with like successe as the Aethiopian doeth his blacknesse, As we shall see.

Ac charge

^a *Quodlib. pag.*
236. See aboue

A Charge against M. Parsons of Rashnesse.

3. In the *Preamble*, I said that I would not vrge him with
 "his owne contradiction, who in his Preface to his Reader
 "saith, *He knoweth not the name of T. M.* and yet in his Epi-
 "stle Dedicatorie vnto both the Vniuersities, which is set be-
 fore the Preface, he mentioned the name of *Tho. Morton*
 at the full; which is a note of rashnesse.

*Preamb. pag. 71.**The summe of M. PARSONS his Reckoning.*

BUt what if this be no contradiction at all, and *M. Morton* did know
 it to be so? First the Dedicatorie Epistle of euery worke is wont to
 be the last thing that is written, or Printed, which *M. Morton* will
 not deny. Secondly, I doe expressly signifie in my said Epistle Dedi-
 catorie, that the said Epistle was written after the Preface and Treatise
 thereof, &c. Thirdly, to conuince him indeede and most apparantly
 of witting and willing fraude in this point, I must tell the Reader, I
 did in the place here cited of the third Chapter of my Treatise, set
 downe clearly and perspicuously when, and by what occasion I came
 to vnderstand, whom the two Letters *T. M.* did signifie, which before
 I vnderstood not. And now let the Reader iudge betweene vs, whe-
 ther it be likely that *M. Morton* knew my Dedicatorie Epistle, wherein
 I take notice of his Name, were written after the common Preface,
 and first two Chapters of the Treatise, or no; and so let him consider of
 his idle obiection.

*Reckon. pag. 227**Reckon. pa. 229**The Reuiewe.*

4. Albeit the matter be of no moment, yet seeing that *M.*
Parsons is so vehemently vrgent, I shall intreate the indiffe-
 rent Reader to do him iustice, after that I shall be vouchsafed
 to speake. I obserue in all this defence, that there is an
Epistle Dedicatorie (wherein the name, *Tho. Morton*, is men-
 tioned) which giueth notice of a *large common Epistle* (where-
 in *M. Parsons* said that he knew not the name) prefixed be-
 fore a *Treatise*; and in the third Chapter of that *Treatise*, the
 occasion is expressed of knowing the name; often telling vs that
 the *Dedicatorie Epistle* was written after the common Preface,
 saying furthermore that hee was *Forced by sicknesse, to lay a-*
side that which he had written; and hence inferreth, that in the

*Mist. cap 3. pag. 89.**Preface*

M. Parsons in-
considerate
taxation.

Preface hee said truly that *hee knew not that name*. In all which his Answer hee hath forgot the principall verbe, viz. [*Printed*:] For if the *Preface*, wherein he saith hee *knew not the name*; were, as he also saith, *laide aside in his writing Papers*, and not Printed till afterwards hee knew the Name at full, then ought hee to haue Corrected the Preface (because now hee knew the name) before it were committed to the Presse: Otherwise, that part of the Preface, to wit, [*As yet I know not his name*,] although it were true in his papers when he writ it, yet must it needes bee a Lie in Print, and a speciall Argument of great rashnesse. And *Rashnesse* being the fault which I imputed vnto M. Parsons, he was too inconsiderate to put this in his Reckoning, for one of the *falsehoods* which were objected against him.

5. Neuerthelesse, lest that I might disturbe the Order of M. Parsons his Reckoning, I thought good to fill vp this his first place, with a perfect falsehood in deede of his owne (not yet mentioned) which is such as may perswade any man of Conscience, that M. Parsons his Conscience hath taken such a leake, as is able to drowne his soule, except hee repent, which I will vnfold in the next Paragraphe.

*A foure fold falsehood committed by M. Parsons
against M. Caluine, in the end of his
last third Chapter.*

MR. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reckon. cap. 3.
pag. 219.

Caluin lib. 3.
Instit. ca. 5. §. 10

* Reckon. pa. 220

Calu. ubi supra.

Finally, Iohn Caluine himselfe, treating of this matter, confesseth that the vse of Prayer for the dead (which supposeth *Purgatorie*) was practised in the Primitive Church aboute one thousand three hundred yeeres agoe: *Ante mille et trecentos Annos* (saith hee) *vbi receptum fuit, ut preces fierent pro defunctis*: It was receiued in vse aboute a thousand three hundred yeeres past, that Prayers should bee made for the soules of them that were departed. And a little after: * where Iohn Caluine in the former place cited, after his confession of the receiued vse of Prayer before one thousand three hundred yeeres, saith, *Sed omnes, scilicet, in errorem abrepti fuerunt*: But all of them, I confesse, were carried away with error.

The

The Renewe.

6. M. Parsons hath singled out of all the bookes of Mr. Caluine this one place, which he presenteth to his Reader for a spectacle of contempt vsed by M. Caluine against auncient Fathers, and hath laid this downe, as it were, for the vp-shot of his whole Reckoning of that his third Chapter. But see (I beseech thee, good Reader) what a knot of falsities hee hath tyed together in this one accusation. First, these wordes *Ante mille annos, &c.* are propounded onely as an Obiection of Romish Doctors, thus: *Cum ergo obijciunt Aduersarij ante mille & trecentos annos &c.* That is, *Whereas my Aduersaries* (saith Caluine) *doe obiect vnto me, that prayers for the dead were wont to be vsed in the Church a thousand, three hundred yeares since:* Secondly, when he commeth to answer, he saith, *Ipsi vero veteres, &c.* But those auncients were carried away with error: Where M. Parsons, to make M. Caluines answer more odious, put in *Omnes veteres*, that is, *All auncient Fathers erred therein*, as though Caluine had condemned them *All* in this point.

M. Parsons per-
fidious forgery

7. Thirdly, Caluine a little after in the same Section, yeeldeth a fuller answer, saying: *Verum ne glorientur Aduersarij nostri, quasi veterem Ecclesiam erroris sui sociam habeant, &c.* But least that our Aduersaries (saith Caluine) may boast, as though they had the auncient Church a companion in their error, I say that there is a great difference between them, for those auncients vsed a memory of the dead, least that they might seeme to haue altogether neglected them, but yet did also confesse, that they did not doubt of the State of the dead: As for Purgatorie (saith Caluine) they held it to be an vncertaine thing. Besides, we might easily produce diuers testimonies of auncient Fathers, whereby the use of those prayers is manifestly confuted. Thus farre Mr. Caluine; signifying that he was not destitute of the iudgement of Antiquity, for the oppugning of the doctrine which was obiected against him: which part of the answer Mr. Parsons hath wholly concealed.

8. Lastly, Caluine (saith M. Parsons) confesseth that the use
X of

of Prayer for the dead (which supposeth Purgatory) was practised, &c. Neuer taking notice that *Caluine* denieth that consequence, holding that *Prayer for the dead doeth not inferre Purgatorie*.

A quadrupl-
citic of M. *Par-*
sons falshoods.

9. Is not here as great a manifestation of witting malice, and falshood (for ought that can appeare to any Reader) as an Aduersarie could possibly vse? First to alleadge *Caluines* obiection, in that sense wherein it was objected, as if it had beene his Assertion: Secondly, by cogging a Die in deede, in foyfing in the word *All*: Thirdly, by concealing *Caluines* more absolute answer: And lastly by implying a consequence; which is by *Caluine* plainly confuted. What will now become of M. *Parsons* his Confidence of his owne sinceritie, who boasteth that there cannot be brought against him any one example of such a falsitie, much lesse thrice three, seeing that here are at least three grosse falshoods in this one? we further enter vpon the falshoods wherewith he was charged in the Preamble.

S E C T. II.

The second Charge of the Clause of Reseruatiō.

Preamb. pag. 5.
& pag. 72.

10. **H**OW could M. *Parsons*, without some Equiuocating "fraude", affirme that the *Clause of Reseruatiō* was not set downe by me in Latine, except onely once, seeing that it was expressed in Latine aboute twentie times?

The summe of M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reckon. pag. 14.

THe trueth is, that my meaning was according to the meaning of M. *Parsons* assertion, promising that he would *alwayes* so set downe the clause of Reseruatiō in Latine, that the simple Reader should not vnderstand it, no more then simple men could vnderstand *Aristotles Philosophy*; in which maner I found it put downe, but once indeede throughout the whole Booke, to wit, in the place before mentioned, that is to say, wholly in Latine, for this hee writeth, comming to the said clause of Reseruatiō: *Loquar enim Latine, ne fidiota anam sibi arripiant nequiter mentiendi, [ut quis temeratur illud detegere.]* Which words hee Englisheth

Englishteth not, and consequently might bee some veyle to the ignorant, not to vnderstand him. But in all other places, though he put in oftentimes, *I know not this*, or that, *Vt tibi dicam, vt tibi reuelam, &c.* Yet doeth he so viter in English all the rest of the cases professed, as the simplest man may vnderstand the same, and consequently I hold them for vttered in English, and not in Latine.

The Reuiew of the former Reckoning.

11. The onely shadow of excuse, which M. Parsons hath, for couert of his former vntrueth (when hee said that *The clause of Reseruatiō* was set downe in Latine but *once*, notwithstanding it bee found in Latine aboue one and twentie times) is to point at *one place*, which hee saith is onely and wholly in Latine, thus: *Loquar enim, &c.* But here he craftily cutteth off the words, which goe immediately before, for thus it standeth in the Booke. ^c *A Catholicke being asked, whether a Priest be in such a place, may, notwithstanding his perfect knowledge to the contrarie, answer, [Hee is not there, vt (loquar enim Latine, ne Idiota ansam sibi arripiant nequiter mentiendi) quis teneatur illud detegere.]* Where it is as apparent that the mentall Equiuocation in this place (for the *Parentthesis* is no part of the sentence) being this, [*Hee is not there*] *Vt quis teneatur detegere*, cannot be said to be wholly in Latine, more then [*I am no Priest,*] *Vt tibi reuelem;* Or, [*I am no Priest,*] *Vt tibi dicam:* Which M. Parsons doth know to haue bene twentie times repeated in that Treatise.

M. Parsons his notable fraude

^c Full Satisf.
Part. 3. pag 48.

12. Wherefore by this Reckoning I am iustly occasioned to charge M. Parsons with two vntrueths, the first for his former saying, that *The clause of Reseruatiō* was put downe in Latine but *once*: The second is for now excusing it, by instanting in *one place*, as though it were put downe wholly in Latine, where notwithstanding the first part of the mentall Equiuocation is as much in English; and the latter part (being the clause of Reseruatiō) no more Latine, then are the twentie other examples of mentall Equiuocation, which I did particularly recount. And thus we see that which we may readily obserue in his other answers, to wit, how fruitfull falsehood

A brace of vntrueths.

hood is, for still one vntrueth doeth engender another. Hath
M. Parsons no more to say for himselfe?

MR. PARSONS his Reckoning.

*Reckon cap. 4. §
 2. pag. 230.*

I Answer that small guilt can be found (though the errour were granted) where no malice or interest can be presumed. For to what end or profite should *P. H. erre* willingly in a matter that importeth him and his cause so little &c.?

The Renew.

His ridiculous
 euasion.

4 Pro. 16. 17.

13. Then belike, he would be thought to haue wronged me in iest: but who knoweth not that euen iesters haue as well teeth in their heads, as reuilers? *Salomon* doth characterize such like fellows: *As he that faineth himselfe mad casteth fire-brands, arrows, and mort all things: so dealeth the deceitfull man with his friend, and saith, Am not I in iest?* As for *Mast. Parsons* he hath intituled himselfe an *Adversarie*, and as all men know, he vseth to ieast vncharitably enough.

S E C T. III.

The third charge against M. Parsons, concerning the Moderate Answerer.

Preamb. p. 71.

14. **W**Here I said particularly of one of your Doctors, surnamed the *Moderate Answerer*, that He *sette himselfe in the chaire of the vnlearned Doctors, reprehended by the Apostle, &c.* because of his shallow Answeres, which he made with an *If, &c.* *Mr. Parsons* in all snuffe and fume rageth against me, as though I had said that *All Romish Doctors were vnlearned.* This I called a *falsehood.*

The summe of MR. PARSONS his Reckoning:

*Reckon cap. 4.
 §. 3. pag. 233.*

I Remit my Reader, for tryall of this, vnto the ponderation of the text it selfe of his said Epistle [To our *deceined Brethren*] and to his inferring wordes applied to our Priests, in calling them an *erring Priesthood.*

hood. And here I demand of M. Morton in sincerity, whether he did meane of our Doctors in generall, or no?

The Review.

15. And I answered in as good sincerity, that I meant no more to perswade that *All* the Romish Doctors were *Unlearned*, then that they were *All* learned. But is not this subtly done of M. Parsons, by asking to seeme to doubt of that, which a very Childe might haue vnderstoode, by a plaine distinction; of one ignorant Priest, which was the *Moderate answerer*. But the *High Priests of the Iews*, did not ignorantly but vnconscionably, and wilfully delude the people, saying that *Christ was stolne out of the grave*, vnto whom that miserable people performed blinde obedience. As for that Title of *Seduced Brethre*, it can make no good cōsequence to proue that I thought *Seducers* to be *unlearned*; no more then if M. Parsons would say, that because *Eue* a silly woman was *Seduced by the Diuell*, therefore the *Diuell*, who deceiued her, was no subtle seducer. Seeing therefore that M. Parsons (after so cleare a conuiction of his error (which any English Reader may perceiue) doth still persist in answering, that he committed

M^r. P. suble
and craftie in
terrogatory.

* Reckon. p. 234.
Two of his fal-
shoods in one.

No error at all, but gave a true explanation of my meaning, he, by this deniall of one *falsehood*, hath made vp two.

SECT. IIIL.

The fourth charge about Goodman.

16. Concerning the seditious doctrine of Goodman, I answered, that *If I should iustifie him, my heart should* *condemne my selfe*, and furthermore called his seditious positions *Wicked and false*: yet did M. Parsons informe his Reader that I did *particularly iustifie Goodman*.

Full satisfact.
part. 2. cap. 3. &
Preamb. p. 73.

The summe of Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

MY wordes were these, that he (T. M.) taketh vpon him more fondly in the second part of his Replie, to make a publike iustification of all Protestants for rebelling against their Princes

Reckon. cap. 4.
§. 4. pag. 235.

in any Countrey whatsoever, but more particularly in *England*, and therein doth he iustifie *Cranmer*, *Ridley*, and others, that conspired against *Q. Mary*: *Knox*, *Buchanan*, *Goodman*, in *Scotland*, as his iustification is a more condemnation of them, then if he had said nothing at all. Which I spake, because he said [if I shall iustifie *Goodman*, although the examples of your Priests might excuse him, yet my heart should condemne my selfe.]

The Renewe.

M. Parsons dissembling his vnderstanding of a triuiall phrase of speech to cloak his grosse falsehood.

17. I thought M. Parsons had beene a professed Diuine, and had read in Scripture that the Prophet doth vpbraide *Ierusalem* and *Israell*, saying that they did *Iustifie Sodome* by their iniquities, that is, (must M. Parsons say, if we admit of his own Comment) God doth commend *Sodome* for her iniquities, because the Scripture saith, that other wicked Cities doe *iustifie Sodome*: whereas euery triuiall Scholler, and almost vulgar man, who hath beene exercised in the Scriptures, knoweth that it is spoken onely by a *Comparison* of two vngodly people together, wherein *Ierusalem* is brought-in to iustifie the other, yet not so, as to acquit *Sodome* of sinne, but euen to aggravate the vngodlinesse of *Hierusalem*, as which exceeded *Sodome* in her wickednesse. Thus, said I, *Although your Priests by their Examples* (namely, of more bloody positions) *might iustifie Goodman*, (as being lesse seditious then they are themselves;) yet if I should not condemne *Goodman*, my heart should condemne my selfe. What can be more plaine to expresse my purpose in condemning *Goodman*, whom notwithstanding M. Parsons, to his no small shame, did say I *Iustified*? Therefore this vntruth also must still remaine vpon his score with the rest.

SECT. V.

*The fift charge against Mr. Parsons about
Knox and Buchanan.*

Full satisfaction,
part. 2. cap. 4.

18.

M. Parsons hath likewise signified vnto the Reader, that I iustified these also, albeit I iudged their doctrine

"*Ettrine Seditious, and worthily condemned by a Parliament in Scotland.*

The summe of Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning

WHereunto I answer, first by the very wordes of his defence in the former obiection, set downe about Goodman, he seeketh to cleare all other, saying; *If I should iustifie this Goodman (though your examples might excuse him) yet my heart should condemne my selfe: But what doe you professe to proue? All Protestants teach positions rebellious: proue it: Here is Goodman, &c. By the example of all the rest, I answere, there is but one. By which answere it is euident he cleareth all the rest. Nor doe I finde that M. Morton did vse these wordes which hee now doth, [Their Seditious doctrine was condemned in Scotland:] Nay, as I noted before, by saying that one Goodman had held positions seditious, he thought to iustifie and cleare both these two.*

*Reckon. cap. 4.
§. 5. p. 240. &
Preamb. p. 74.*

The Reviewe.

19. I maruel by what priuiledge M. Parsons is imboldened thus to face out a matter so manifestly false, as the meanest English Reader may see. For concerning Knoxe and Buchanan, I said that: *An Aſſe of Parliament calld in the booke* of Buchanan, censuring all such contemptes and Innomations, Adding that, you may not call that the doctrine of the Church of Scotland, which the generall current of the Church and State did condemne in publique Parliament, such is the seditious doctrine of resisting and deposing of Kings. But yet thus it became M. Parsons to couer his former faithlesse dealing with a shamelesse deniall, which (lest it should not be manifest enough) he maketh more visible by a palpable vntruth: and yet againe.

*Full satisfact.
part. 2. cap. 4.*

*M. Parsons out-
facing of truth.*

*His double vn-
truth.*

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

N Ay, as I noted before, by saying that onely one Goodman had held positions seditious, he thought to iustifie and cleare both these two, and all other their companions from iust reprehension. Whereby you see how idle an obiection against mee this is of wilfull falshood.

Reckon. ib. p. 241.

The

The Renewwe.

^a Full satisfact.
part. 2. p. 103.

A newfalshood
of M. Parsons,
in defence of
an olde.

20. Be pleased (good Reader) to looke vpon the place it selfe, and if M. Parsons haue dealt sincerely in this point of Reckoning, then discharge him in all the rest. I writ thus concerning Goodman: ^b Here is one Goodman who. in his publique booke doth maintaine them. I haue no other meanes to annoyde these straits, which you obiect by the example of one, to conclude All Protestants rebellious, then by example of all the rest, to answere there is but one. Particularly intreating of the examples of English Protestants, whom the Moderate Answerer had objected, and spending the whole third Chapter for the iustifying of the English Writers, excepting Goodman, whom I there held worthy of condemnation.

21. After, in the fourth Chapter, intituled [The objections against the Church of Scotland] I answered (as is aforesaid) for the condemning of Knoxe and Buchanan: whereas there is not so much as any intimation of these two in the other place: Was there euer man so distortedly squint-eyed, who could looke North-ward and South-ward in one moment, as M. Parsons hath done, who could not distinguish the speech, which particularly concerned England, from that which was applied onely vnto Scotland. Hee held it sufficient, if I could shew but Three plaine falshoods for his conuiction, here we finde in this one charge Three, which are not of the least size.

SECT. VI.

The sixth charge against M. Parsons, touching
Mast. Campian.

^a Full satisfact.
part. 1. p. 20. &
Preamb p. 75.

22. **T**He testimony of M. Campian was brought to accuse ^a M. Caluine, concerning his doctrine of calling Christ a vild, and censuring it to be monstrous: Vnto the which crimination vsed by M. Campian, and by sixe other Ro-
"milh

"mish Doctors against *Caluine*, I opposed the iudgement of
 "Card. *Bellarmino*, who iustifieth the sense of *Caluine*, as be-
 ing *Catholicke*: yet did Mr. *Parsons* so relate the matter, by
 changing *Campion* into *Bellarmino*, as though I had foolishly
 brought in *Bellarmino* to be contrary to himselfe: This I tooke
 to be a witting fallshood.

The summe of Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

BEcause vpon the word [*your Iesuite*] *M. Morton* placed the letter (r)
 for reference in the margin vnto *Campion*, and vpon the next Au-
 thour put downe the letter (r) vpon the quotation of *Bellarmino*
 to the same effect, rescuing the opinion of *Caluine* and *Bega*; the letters
 being very small, the one was taken for the other, and the name of *Bel-
 larmine* set downe in the text, in stead of *Campion*: the difference impor-
 ting nothing at all, yet doth *M. Morton* make a great matter of it, as
 though it had beene done of malice, when as for me to change volunta-
 rily these two names, *Cui bono*?

Reckon. p. 243.

The Review.

23. Here *M. Parsons* confesseth his errour, but saith that
 he did it not voluntarily, or vpon an euill intent But alas the
 good mans meaning bewrayeth it selfe, by the manner of his
 owne Accusation, wherein hee spared not to note me for a
 * *Shifter*, by intending to *deceiue the Reader*: Neuerthelesse
 perceiuing his owne vngracious shift discovered, he will haue
 me to take it for a reasonable part of a Reckoning, to answer,
Cui bono? that is, *What good would it haue beene for me* (saith
 he) *to haue done this willingly*? When as he should rather haue
 asked, *Cui malo*? that is, *To whom hee might worke a mis-
 chiefe hereby*; especially seeing that he doth bewray almost
 in euery page, that it is his cordiall *good* to traduce mee, and
 make me odious, as if I were (God forgiue him) the vilest *shif-
 ter* and *falsificator* that hath beene heard of. And yet the
 poore man thinketh to be excused by the littlenesse of the
 superiour letters (r. and r.) who notwithstanding was him-
 selfe so Eagle-eyed, in discerning in *verò* and *vere*, the two lit-
 tle vowels, *ò*, and *è*.

* *Mitig. cap. 6 n.*
53. & 54. p. 230.

*M. Parsons con-
 fessed errour.*

His miserable
 excuse.

* See hereaf-
 ter, §. 11.

MR. PARSONS *his Reckoning, concerning*
CALVINES *avt6ds* ②.

Reckon. pag. 243.
② 244.

Bellarmin. l. 2 de
Christo. ca. 69.

BUT now for the thing it selfe, albeit *Bellarmino* in the place here quoted doe shew, that, according to the Exposition of *Josias Simlerus* a Calvinist, the words of *John Calvine*, in a certaine sense may haue a true meaning, yet simply and absolutely doth he condemne the same as Hereticall, saying, *Calvinum existimo, quoad modum loquendi, sine dubio errasse*. I doe thinke without doubt, that *Calvine* did erre in his maner of speech. (A little after the relation of the sentence of the Booke) Whereby it appeareth that *Bellarmino*, neither is contrarie to himselfe, neither to *Fa. Campian*, and other Catholicke writers before mentioned: for that all of them doe agree, that the maner of *Calvines* speech is hereticall, dangerous, and to bee avoided, though in some strained sense it may passe.

The Reniewe.

* *Iob. 14. 28.*

M. Parsons
saithlesse dea-
ling against
Calvine.

24. *Heresie* (as Mr. *Parson* knoweth) consisteth not in words, but in sense: for these words of Scripture, * *My Father is greater then I*, are vsed both by Catholickes and Heretickes; but by Catholickes in a true, by Hereticks in a false sense. Now where I produced Romish Authors, condemning the foresaid sentence of *Calvine* (concerning *avt6ds* ②) iudging the sense thereof *Hereticall*, &c. and opposed *Bellarmino* against them, iustifying the sense of *Calvine* as Catholicke: M. *Parsons* endeauoureth to reconcile his Romish Authors, as though they all agreed to condemne *Calvines maner of speech*, and to allow his sense. I should maruell that Mr. *Parsons* durst seeke to delude his Reader with so open falsehoods, but that his disposition is now habited by vs.

^a Full satisfact.
part. 1. c. ap. 7.

^b Rat. 8.

^c Annot. in *Iob.*
1. 1.

^d Lib. 3. de Notis
verbi Dei.

^e Stapleton.

Prompt. ser. 3.

post. Dom. F. ass.

25. For the accusations of the Romish writers against *Calvine*, were ^a thus specified by me. First ^b *Campian*, calling "the Doctrine of *Calvine portentum*: Next, their ^c *Rhemish* "Translatours, calling it *Blasphemie*: After ^d *Possennius*, calling it *Atheisme*: Then ^e *Stapleton*, calling it a wicked *Heresie*, which *Fernardinus* (saith hee) doth notably refute. And can these agree with the iudgement of Cardinall *Bellarmino*, who iustificieth the sense of *Calvine* to be *Catholique*? And for M. *Parsons* his further conuiction, I shall desire my Reader

but

but onely to heare the words of *Bellarmino* himselfe in the place allcaded. *Genebrard* (saith hee) and *Lindanus*, and *Canisius*, (all *Romane* Authors) did attribute vnto *Caluine* this Heresie: Neuertheless, when I doe examine the matter (saith *Bellarmino*) and doe diligently ponder the sentence of *Caluine*, I dare not pronounce that he was in this error.

25. Doe you not heare *Genebrard*, *Lindanus*, and *Canisius*, pronouncing *Caluine* an *Hereticke* for that opinion, for which *Bellarmino* saith, that hee himselfe durst not condemne *Caluine*? How then could *M. Parsons* say truly, that these writers doe agree? Herein hee offereth no small iniurie vnto *Bellarmino*, whom whilst he would reconcile vnto others, he maketh to be an *Adversarie* to himselfe, as though *Bellarmino* had condemned *Caluine* in that, wherein he iustified him, according to the Index of his Booke: * *Caluini sententia impij et auidius explicatur, & defenditur*, That is: *The sentence of Caluine concerning auidius is explained and defended*. But especially hee wrongeth his owne conscience, by an inexcusable falshood.

* Tom. 3. Edit.
Lugduni, Anno
1596.

SECT. VII.

The senenth Charge.

27. **M.** *Parsons* in his *Mitigation* brought me in as *Confessing*, in effect, all that my *Adversarie* the moderate *Answerer* had objected against *Protestants*: when as contrariwise there was scarce any thing^h objected (excepting the aboue named examples of *Goodman*, *Knox*, *Buchanan*, and *Muntzer*,) which I did not particularly confute. These and almost euery particular instance I then prosecuted, oftentimes by the confessions of their owne *Doctors*, whom *M. Parsons* in his *Answer* durst not so much as touch by any mention. And could such like confutations be, In effect, a confessing of all? This seemed vnto me to bee a large and lauish falshood. Let vs see what account *Mr. Parsons* will make for this.

ⁱ Mitig. cap. 4.
num. 14. & Tre-
amb pag 76.

^h See full satisfi-
Part. 2.

The summe of M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

*Reckon. pa. 247.
248.*

Although he vsed all possible Art that hee could to answer, yet are his Answers such, where hee doeth answer (for to sundry chiefe points he saith nothing at all) as doe easily shew that in substance he confesseth all, and cannot denie what is obiected; and where hee seeketh to denie any thing, there hee intangleth himselfe more, then if flatly hee confessed the same. And in prooffe hereof, I spend a dozen leaues at least, in refuting all his Answers, proouing that they yeeld not a full, but a faint satisfaction.

The Reuerſe.

¹ *Full satisfact.
Part. 2.*

² *Mitig. pag. 112*
where his Discourse of 12. leaues beginneth.

His many falsehoods in one.

28. This you haue now affirmed, and that in Print, even in Romane letters. But I appeale vnto any Reader vnderstanding English to iudge hereof, what I haue done in confutation of the *moderate Answerer*, the particular instances & there obiected doe fully manifest, which concerned either *England, Fraunce, Genena, Germanie*, yea, or the losse of *Rhodes*, and part of *Hungarie*, which (according to the report of their owne Histories) befell thorow the couetousnesse of Pope *Adrian*. Secondly, what Mr. *Parsons* hath not Answered in his Dozen leaues of his *Mitigation*, vnto the second part of the *Full satisfaction*, consisting of twelue Chapters, will be as euident: Wherein any may obserue the diuers Arguments then vsed, for the defence of Protestants, which Mr. *Parsons* passed ouer without Answer; the Summarie points whereof are these.

¹ *Full satisfact.
Part. 2. p. 97. 98.*

² *Ibid. pag. 99.*

³ *Ibid. pag. 108.*

⁴ *Ibid. pag. 109.*

⁵ *Ibid. pag. 111.*

⁶ *Ibid. pag. 121.*

& 123.

29. ¹ First the generall Doctrine of Protestants, by (as *Bellarmino* confesseth) expounding the place of *Saint Paul, Rom. 13.* to signifie that the *Pope*, and all Ecclesiasticall persons, ought to bee subiect vnto Princes. ² Secondly, that the English Protestants (by the confession of the Iesuite *Salmeron*.) Doe acknowledge a *Soueraigntie of Kings in cases Ecclesiasticall*. Thirdly, the expresse Doctrine of *Caluine*, and of *Beza*, aduancing the Authoritie of *Kings*. Fourthly, the iustifying of the Protestants in *France*, from the testimonies of Romish Historians. Fifthly, (to omit some other proofes) acquitting *Luther*, by his owne expresse Doctrine,

ctrine, and by other evidences, confuting the ¹standers, ²*Ibid. pag. 127.*
 which the moderate Answerer cast vpon him, which M. Parsons
 nimblely skipped ouer, in fauour of his shinnesse, playing the
 very Mare-maide, a woman aboue water, talking largely,
 and promising a confutation of all points, but when he com-
 meth to the principals, — *Atrum desinit in piscem*, as mute
 as a Fish, as might bee manifested by many examples. *Simile.*
 In the meane time we may reckon this his last Assertion, in the num-
 ber of his *granida mendacia*, because this one falshood is big
 with many other falshoods in the belly thereof.

S E C T. VIII.

The eight Charge, concerning a Transition, asking
[haue you ought to say to their practise?]

30. **I**^a Was accused by M. Parsons, to haue dissembled the
 practises of Caluine and Beza, which were obiected by
 the moderate Answerer, and to haue vsed this Interrogation,
 “[Haue you any thing to say to their practise?] in an hypocriti-
 “call dissemblance, as though nothing had beene obiected
 against them, to the end that I might passe them ouer, and
 answere nothing at all: ^bAlbeit it bee most euident by the
 “place it selfe, that I vsed that Interrogation by way of a
 “Transition onely, to the end that I might more emphati-
 cally and effectually, both note and confute the obiections
 against Caluine and Beza, which immediately I also perfor-
 med. Therefore M. Parsons in accusing me of *Disimulation*
 and *hypocrisie*, did me no litle iniurie, and now commeth hal-
 ting in with a strange manner of Reckoning.

^a Mitigat. cap. 4.
 pag. 131.

^b Preamb. pa. 77

The summe of M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

I Am so equall and easie to bee intreated in this matter, or rather so
 indulgent, as I am content to accept of his interpretation, profes-
 sing sincerely notwithstanding, that I vnderstood him in another
 meaning, when I wrote my Booke, the words themselves leading mee
 thereunto: Howsoeuer it bee, there can bee no least matter of malice

*Reckon. cap. 4.
 §. 8 pag. 248.*

framed against me. True it is, he endeauoureth both before and after to Answer vnto diuers proofes of seditious practises, obiected by his Aduersaries against *Caluine* and *Beza*.

The Renewe.

31. In this part of his Reckoning I shall desire my Reader to obserue these two points: *M. Parsons* his maner of Confession, and protestation, for they are remarkeable. He confesseth now that in that place I *Endeavored both before and after, to Answer vnto the seditious practises obiected against Caluine and Beza*, and yet accused me in his *Mitigation*, for concealing the whole matter, rating and reuyling me, and calling my *Satisfaction* in this point *Hypocrisie* and *Disimulation*, so farre forth as to make me a man *not to be trusted hereafter*. But why? for concealing and dissembling forsooth such obiections against *Caluine* and *Beza*, which now, vpon better consideration, he confesseth I did not dissemble, but expressely mentioned, and also endeauoured to answer them.

The excellent
Art of *M. Parsons*, in confessing his witting falshood so, as though hee would not confesse it.

32. Thou seest then (Christian Reader) how vile and hainous an opprobrie *M. Parsons* laide vpon me, euen of [*Not to be trusted hereafter*;] and vpon how friuolous and false a pretence, according as he hath here plainly confessed. I call the Confession plaine, because hee graunteth I did not concale them.

33. Notwithstanding, marke I beseech thee, in what manner he conueigheth this his Confession, which he beginneth thus: *I am so equall and easie to bee intreated, or rather so indulgent, as I am content to accept of his interpretation, &c.* See now, after that hee had beene charged with egregious impudencie, by his false imputation of *Hypocrisie* & *Disimulation*, and being at length ashamed of his owne discovered nakednesse, although he cannot denie his errour, yet doth hee not cast away all the Fig-leaues of couert, and although hee cannot but yeeld, yet will he seeme so to yeeld, as onely vpon an *Intreatie*, forsooth, which indeede he doth vpon a *Charge* and *Challenge*; and to be onely content to doe that, which he doth by constraint; and to haue condescended onely in the way of
Indul-

Indulgence, which he doth thorow the evidence of his owne guiltinesse. I suppose that *Theophrastus* did neuer shewe a more lively Character and Picture of any vice, then is this Character of a smooth and subtile Reckoner, which is exemplified in this confession of *M. Parsons*, who so acknowledgeth his most manifest error, as if hee did not, or would not acknowledge it, which maketh me to hold his *Protestation* to be lesse credible.

34. His *Protestation* is, that *He then understood the matter otherwise*; that is to say, otherwise then he dooth now in his more *Sober Reckoning*: which doubtlesse (if he had bin then truly *Sober*) he could not have understood otherwise, as may be made evident by a like example of a Lawyer pleading in this manner: *The debt which your Client challengeth of the defendant, is of two sorts, the one is upon Bills, the other upon Bonds; I have answered unto all that you can challenge by vertue of Bills, what have you to say to the Bonds? The Bonds, you say, were made upon due considerations, and before divers competent witnesses: whereunto I answer, that the considerations are unlawfull, and the witnesses are insufficient, and (that which will discover the invalidity of the Bonds most) they are razed and interlined.* Thus the Pleader for the defendant. Presently starteth vp a Lawyer for the contrary part, and desireth to bee heard for the Plaintife. *My Lord (saith he to the Iudge) the last Pleader, concerning the debts challenged by vertue of Bonds, hath said thus: What have you to say for the Bonds? as though nothing had beene said thereunto: Did we not allege that there were faire instruments, that there were due considerations, that there were sufficient witnesses, &c. What a notorious dissimulation and Hypocrisie was it then in him, to conceale our allegations? Or how can your Lordship suffer such a one to plead in your presence? His Aduersary standeth vp, and replieth, saying, Your Lordship seeth the impudencie of this fellow, for I have both mentioned the Bonds, the witnesses and considerations; and have particularly answered and disabled these his objections. In the end the perterse wrangling Lawyer perceiuing his owne folly, maketh the same Apologie for himselfe, which *M. Parsons**

The palpability of *M. Parsons* fallshood, against which he doth now protest.

A Simile.

sons hath done. Well, I am so equall and easie to be intreated in this matter, or rather indulgent, as I am contented to yeeld unto your interpretation: protesting sincerely, that I understood you in another meaning. Would not such a protestation, ioyned with such a confession, mooue eyther laughter or indignation? Such is the case betweene me and M. Parsons in euery degree, and yet will he be thought to haue dealt sincerely.

S E C T. IX.

The ninth Charge, touching the testimony of Holinshed.

4 Full satisfact.
part. 2. pag. 102.
& Preamb. 80.
&c.
* Mitig. p. 128.

35. **W**Hereas I^d related onely *Holinshed*, to proue that there was not any *Scruple* of Religion obiected against *Wyat* in the *Oration* of *Q. Mary*: "M. Parsons, to prooue me a falsificator, leauing the Authour *Holinshed*, put "in his place *M. Foxe*, and concludeth against me, that *The Minister* lieth openly. He now bestirreth himselfe in this case.

The summe of M^r. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reckon. pa. 252.

THough the History of *Holinshed* doth relate the pretence of *VViat* to haue been against the *Queenes* marriage, concealing and dissembling the point of Religion in that place (which else-where he confesseth, as after shall be seene) yet *John Foxe*, a more auncient and authentickall Historiographer then he, doth plainly set downe, that together with the pretence of marriage; the cause of Religion was also pretended, &c. And it cannot be presumed, but that *M. Marston* had seene and read this, yet durst affirme, that there was no mention of Religion at all in *VViat*s pretence: Which is the first lie.

The Renewe.

36. Doe you see the falshood of this *Reckoner*? he is charged to haue put vpon me the testimony of *M. Foxe*, as though I had cyted it contrary to his meaning, which I did not indeede so much as mention: And now at length perceiuing his own fraude to be laid open, whereunto hee cannot answere one word,

word, he doth onely endeavour to bring me into his owne predicament of falsifying by another trick, so, as if in reckoning he meant to play some stoppage of debt. But I asked *M. Parsons* why he did so faithlesly and maliciously change *Holinshed* into *Foxe*? he answereth iust nothing: This is *Soberly* and *quietly* Reckoned. Thus much for my charge against him. Let vs heare what he hath now against me.

M. Parsons not able to denie his former falshood, doth conceale it.

MR. PARSONS his Reckoning.

AND the same *M. Foxe* also sheweth, that in the Oration of *Q. Mary*, that their pretence of marriage seemed to be but a Spanish Cloake, to cover their pretended purpose against Religion. And this testimony of *M. Foxe* must needs haue beene knowne to *M. Morton*, and consequently here is a second lie.

The Review.

37. *Holinshed* is a professed Historian, and writ a large and determinate Storie of all memorable things, which were done in the daies of *Q. Mary*, and other Kings of England after her raighe: but the subiect and matter of the *Actes and Monuments* written by *M. Foxe*, is the passions and Martyrdomes of the faithful, both of ancient and latter times, not onely in *England*, but also in other Countries; as for other matters of Historie, he relateth them but *obiter*, not professedly, nor yet so copiously, as *Holinshed* hath done: Wherefore it is as great indiscretion in *M. Parsons* to challenge me to neglect *Holinshed*, and in a point of History to take my Certificate from *M. Foxe*, whom then I had not; presuming that I must needs haue seene and read that sentence in him, to drawe me thereby into suspition of a wilfull falshood: wherein he hath giuen vs the perfect length of his owne foote, because *malamens, malum animus*, that is, according to the English Proverb, As a man useth himselfe, so he museth and iudgeth of others. For could any but a selfe-guilty minde censure another so peremptorily, that he must needs haue seene a booke, which might haue bin wanting, and was not (as I haue shewed) so needefull to be seene? But I leaue this to *M. Parsons* more so-

His indiscretion.

His precipitate ialousie,

ber consideration: wherein it may be, he will be contented to thinke that he hath done me an injury. VVhat yet more?

MR. PARSONS *his Reckoning.*

*Reckon cap. 4.
§ 9 pag. 153.*

VVHer as he saith that no Minister of the Gospel was brought in question, as a Commotioner in that cause, it is both false in it selfe, and cautelously set downe, for it being notorious that al Protestants in England did concur in the rebellion of the D. of Northumberland, who can doubt but that in the second also of Wiat they had their hearts there, although not so fully their hands. And that Cranmer and Ridley with others, were not brought into publicke iudgement for tryall, the same Master Saunders yeeldeth a reason, for that Q. Mary being a zealous Catholicke would haue them rather called in question for heresie, which is treason against God, then for conspiracy or commotion, w^hich was a treason against her person.

The Reuerie.

† Part. 2. p. 101.

*† Full satisfact.
ibid.*

*† Thuan. Tom. 1.
l. 9. An. 1553.
pag. 954.*

*M. Sanders odd
euation, about
Heresie and
Treason.*

38. In the *† Full Satisfaction* you haue bin answered, concerning Mr. Cranmer, Ridley, and others, that they could not be challenged of any crime of treason, & where of you might not aswell make the State parties, which accorded vnto the testament of K. Edward 6. in the behalfe of Lady Iane, as their owne Historian[†] Thuanus doth report: what better reason can there be for their discharge, then is this confession, to wit, that they were not called in question of Treason in the dayes of Q. Mary? As for the Answer made by Saunders, it is nothing but his vnseasonable figment: For where was it euer heard, that any State put a man to death for heresie, whom they might cut off for treason? For although heresie be a more heynous crime, yet the Hereticke recanting is receiued againe into fauor: but a Traytor notwithstanding his repentance, is to giue satisfaction of the law, by suffering death. The Church dealeth as a Mother, the law as a Iudge. Neyther can the former Answer consist with Christian policie: for if a man be both a Traytor and an Hereticke, it would be lesse preiudiciall vnto Religion, to execute him for Treason, then for his opinion, because euen the ashes of but one burnt for an Hereticke, doth breede some wormes of like nature,

ture. Finally, common wit and vnderstanding of a man will teach him, that whosoever is both guilty of heresie and Treason, he should be accused and convicted of them both, that by the heynousnesse of his Treason, his Heresie might seeme more odious. By this we see vnto what poore and miserable shift M. Parsons is brought, which hee knew he must eyther haue vsed, or else haue inarred his whole Reckoning.

M. Parsons
poore shift.

39. He furthermore addeth, that he hath since *Tooke the paines to search Holinshed more diligently, and hath found that he doth more expressly affirme, that the Commons and many of the Nobility conspired to raise warre both for the marriage, and for the cause of Religion.* He may the more easily excuse me, if I did not so readily meeete with that, which cost him so diligent paines to finde out; which I had lesse cause to inquire into, seeing that in the large *Oration of Q. Mary* against Sir Thomas *Wiats*, reported by *Holinshed*, there is no such scruple, concerning Religion, to be found, which is al that I vndertooke then to auouch. For as for *Wiats intention*, how good soeuer it might seeme to be, I did not iustifie it, because (as I then said) *Lawfull things must be performed by lawfull meanes*: signifying that his taking vp of armes against the *Queene*, could not be warranted by presumption of any good intent. We proceede to our other accounts: of the *Three charges* next following M. Parsons giueth vs a breefe note.

Reckon. ibid.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

IN signe that M. Mortons matter now groweth barren, in obiecing of wilful falsities against me, he beginneth to huddle vp diuers of them together, but of so small moment, and so fully answered, and confuted before, as it is euident he seeketh but some shewe of number to helpe himselfe for some ostentation.

Reckon. cap. 4.
§. 10. pag. 260.

The Reuerie.

40. It was not barrennesse, but the briefnesse of a *Preamble*, which occasioned me to remit other your falsities vnto a further discovery, as before wee end our Reckoning, will abundantly appear. For this present we are now to recal those

charges, which you haue handled in your first Chapter, which I promised (for one more orderly passage) to reduce vnto their proper places, and therefore I now begin with the Answer vnto the next charge.

S E C T. X.

The tenth charge, concerning the text of Esay 29.

41. I Set downe for the poësie of my *Preamble*, the text of "*Esay*, 29.9. *Ye are blinde, and make others blinde.* This *M. Parsons* so canuased, as intimating (as I said) that I had forged a Text of Scripture; and that the wordes were by mee "*falsly alleadged*, which I proued in him to bee a slanderous and vnconscionable taxation. He is to Reckon vnto me for this also.

** Preamb. p.
23. &c.*

The summe of Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning, concerning a Text of Scripture.

Reckon. p. 43.

I Doe not say that hee bath forged a Text, but that the sentence of his Poësie against Catholickes, pretended to be taken out of this place of *Esay*, 29.9. is falsly alleadged, corrupted and mangled, the same not being found there eyther in wordes or sense.

The Reniew, noting Mr. Parsons his apparant falshood.

*M. Parson for-
geth an excuse
apparently
falic.*

*¹ Mitig. pa. 88.
and in his Rec-
kon. pa. 42.*

42. What call you *forgerie* *M. Parsons*? Is not the corrupting of a *Writ*, so that it be not the same eyther in word or sense, plaine *forgerie*? or can there be any greater then is the corruption of holy writte? Therefore the action which you laid, is an action of *forgerie*. But whom did you note to be the corrupter? your owne wordes are these: ¹ *I cannot well pretermit, for ending of this Chapter, one little note more of rare singularity in this man (namely, T. M.) above others, which I scarce euer haue obserued in any one of his fellowes, and this it is, that the very first wordes of Scripture alleadged by him in the first page of his booke, for the poësie of his Pamphlet, are falsly*

"*falsly alleadged, corrupted, and mangled, though they containe*
 "*but one only verse of Esay the Prophet: and then may you ima-*
 "*gine what liberty he will take to himselfe afterward, throughout*
 "*his whole Discourse.* Adding much more bitternesse of Ca-
 lumniation. But this is sufficient to shew, that I haue been thus
 bedawbed with his vile and false imputations of *rare singula-*
rity aboue all my fellowes, and that for *falsifying and corrupting a*
Text of Scripture: And yet dooth not this honest man blush
 to tell vs that hee had not accused mee of *forging a Text*
of Scripture; nor is hee ashamed to note me of *rare singu-*
larity aboue all my fellowes: for alleadging this translation of
 the Text, which standeth so in our English Bible, common
 vnto me, with *all my fellowes*. This last point calleth for a bet-
 ter Reckoning.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

NEither did I see, or looke for the English translation.

*Reckon. quo
supra.*

The Renew.

43. Dooth this dealing agree with that propertie of an
 honest man, whom you would seeme to be, *Not to looke the*
 common English translation, which might haue freed mee
 from the slander of so *rare singularity in corrupting a Text*, if
 yet there had beene in it any corruption? As this doth but a
 litle lessen your fraud, so doth it much aggravate your malice,
 which was bent to make me obnoxious aboue *all my fellowes*.
 I haue not done with you yet, for we must Reckon for a third
 falshood of yours, where you affirm that the sense of the Text
 is so notoriously corrupted..

Mr. P. bent to
 slander his ad-
 uersary.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning, concerning the
sense of the Text.

I Said that the 9. verse of Esay 19. is falsly alleadged, corrupted and man-
 gled, the same being not found there, eyther in wordes or sense.* And
 now, for your conuincement in this place, I meane to stand vpon the
 originall Texts themselues, and the verse by you alleadged, to see whe-
 ther your poeie against vs may be framed thereof. First then the He-
 brew hath it thus, as both Paeninus, & atabulus, and others doe set it downe
Re astonished and wonder shew vp your eyes, and let them be shut, be ye drunke,

*Recko. p. 43. n. 67.
 * Ibid. p. 44. n. 69.*

Z. 3.

but:

but not with wine, doe you reele, but not with Sifera. Or otherwise: They haue shouted and cried, are drunke, but not with wine. And the Greeke Septuagint thus: Doe you faint, &c.

The Reuerſe.

M. Parsons per-
tinacy in his
error.

^m Preamb. p. 14.

44. Belike M. Parsons being angrie with himſelfe, for his former boldeneſſe with the Hebrew Text, meant now to redouble his owne diſgrace vpon himſelfe, by ſaying that *Pagnine, Vatablus, and others* (who follow the Hebrew) haue not any thing agreeable to our Engliſh Translation, [*Ye are blinde and make men blinde*], eyther in word or ſenſe. For he could not but remember, that I^malleadged, for defence of the Engliſh, the wordes of *Pagnine*, printed Anno 1528, reading the ſame verſe thus: *Excacati ſunt, & alios excacauerunt*, that is, "*They are blinde, and haue blinded others*. I cited alſo their owne Doctor *Heſtor Pintus* vpon the ſame verſe, who ſheweth that in the Hebrew it is read thus: *Tour Priests ſhall be blinde, and make others blinde*: Beſides *Vatablus* himſelfe, "who readeth the Text thus: *Be ye aſtoniſhed and wonder, Oblinite vobismetipſis oculos*, that is, *Daube vp your eyes*. And "in his Annotations vpon the ſame wordes, he paraphraſeth "thus; *They haue blinded themſelues, and made others blinde*. So that (for we are to deale only wth the Hebrew text, which differeth not in ſenſe eyther from the Greeke or Latine) our Engliſh is hereby ſufficiently confirmed.

His threefold
falſity.

45. Therefore M. Parsons in the vp-shot of this *Reckoning* is becomie chargeable for three falſhoods; the firſt is his former falſe accuſation, in challenging mee of *corrupting a Text of Scripture*: the ſecond is his now-denying that hee meant to note me for *forging a Text*: the third, by vrging the Engliſh Translation, as being altogether different from the *Hebrew* in ſenſe, which, by the iudgement of their own Hebritians, is very conſonant. And thus our *Conſcionable Reckoner* forſooth, who would ſeeme not to bee guilty of *Three falſhoods* thoroughout all his books, is often diſplaid to be guilty of *Three* in one Section.

SECT.

S E C T. XI.

The eleauenth Charge, concerning Carerius.

46. **W**Hether M. Parsons did iustly^m charge me with altering of the Title of a Booke of *Carerius de Potestate Rom. Pontificis*; and with changing of *verò* into *verè*? mPreamb. pa. 15

The summe of M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

NOW M. Marten will cleare himselfe, and produceth to this purpose an other Edition, Printed at *Colen*, that hath these points as he citeth them. Which Edition, though I haue not seene, nor heard off before, yet doe I thinke it meete to giue credit vnto his affirmation, nor will I doe him that iniurie as to doubt thereof, especially for so much as he saith. that hee hath shewed the same to many friends of his, naming also the yeere and forme in which it was Printed, all which being granted, and that in this latter *Colen* Impression, the Addition of *Contra Hæreticos, &c.* may haue beene added, which was not in mine, yet doth this inferre nothing against me, nor my charitic. Reckon. pag. 47.

The Remewe.

47. Except M. Parsons first prooue himselfe to be of better credit, then either I haue reason to presume of, or his owne fellow *Priest will acknowledge, who hath charged him with loose *Equiuocating, lying, and cogging*, I shall not greatly desire his credence. It may bee, that he hath seene some *Colen* Edition, clearing me of his former imputation of *falsehood*, and that afterwards he beleued his owne eyes, and became ashamed of his former rash presumption, to say so omnisciently that, *There is but one Edition of Carerius*, and thereupon hath hee beene moued to vse more sobrietic in censuring of Titles and tearmes. But what will hee say further vnto the matter it selfe? * See aboue, lib. 1. cap. 1. &c.

M. Parsons his
rash and pe-
remptorie Af-
fection,

M^r. PARSONS his Reckoning, for a Grammaticall quiddity.

BUT now for the second point objected of *verè*, for *verè*, though M. Marten doe alleadge in like maner for his excuse, the authoritie or rather the error of his *Colen* Edition, yet cannot hee so easily discharge Reckon. pag. 47. num. 74.

discharge himſelfe thereof, for that the very contexture of ſpeech muſt needes argue to his conſcience, that it ſhould be *verè* and not *verē*, for that otherwiſe their ſhould haue beene no apt ſenſe, nor any coniunctiue Particle, to connect the teſtimonie of *Celſus Mancinus* to the former. The great letter *C*, alſo in the beginning of *Celſus* (if this bee not in like maner altered in *M. Mortons* Edition from the originall) muſt needes haue ſhewed vnto him, that it was no Nowne Adiectiue, but a proper name of a man, and conſequently muſt bee ioyned with *verè*, and not with *verē*.

The Renew.

48. Good *M. Parsons*, if I ſhould ſay I were aſhamed of your ignorance, you would ſay that I ſpake it in *choler*: Therefore I will but onely propound vnto you your error, and then will you (I thinke) bee aſhamed of your ſelfe. You haue ſaid that *Celſus* being no Nowne Adiectiue, but a proper name of a man, could not bee ioyned with *verè*. But I doe contrarily affirme that there is no proper name, which doeth both betoken a mans perſon, and alſo ſignifie ſome proper tie and qualitie agreeable vnto that name, but it may be vſed both Subſtantiuely and Adiectiuely with *verè*, as *Celſus* was, which was the proper name of *Mancinus*, and Adiectiuely ſignifieth *Loſtne*.

M. Parsons learnedly bewrayeth his want of learning in a Grammaticall quidditie.

49. For you know that *Pius* ſignifieth godly, and it was the name of many of your Popes: If I ſhould ſay of your Pope *Pius Secundus*, *iam audiamus Pontificem verè Pium*, would you ſay that I had offended againſt my *Grammer*? Nay, is not euery ſuch citation a ſingular elegancie of ſpeech? Lend your eare (amongſt infinite examples of this kind) to your owne Doctour *Barkley*, who ſpeaking of *S. Ambroſe*, ſaith; *O Dominum Antiftitem verè Ambroſium, cuius ex diſtis factiſq̃, tanquam ex ſacro quodam penario, iam ſuaſam capimus Ambroſiam*, That is: O that Prelate, truly *Ambroſe*, from whoſe writings and workes, as out of an holy Store-houſe, we may take the ſweete *Ambroſia* of Euangelicall truth, ſo he. *M. Parsons*, I thinke, will not compare with *Barkley* in *Grammer* learning, and though he ſhould, it would bee but according to the prouerbe, *Sus Minervam*. This word, *Iacob*, which ſignifieth a ſupplanier, was the proper name of a Patriarke,

Bacclarius contra Monarchom.
li. 3. ca. 5. pa. 137

Patriarke, the yonger Sonne of *Isaac*, vnto whom his brother *Eſau* ſpake, ſaying: *Was he not truly called Iacob, for hee hath ſupplanted me twice?* I now demand, if *Eſau* had ſaid vnto him, behold one truly *Iacob*, would M. *Parſons* his learning, licence him to condemne that ſpeech of incongruitie? Although I haue M. *Parſons* now at this aduantage, yet will I not (in requital of his owne ſcurrilitie, about the *Sylogiſme*) ſend him vnto the *Schoole againe to learne* his Grammer, but rather hold it ſufficient to haue thus admoniſhed him hereof.

Gene. 27. 36.

SECT. XII.

*The twelueſh Charge, concerning Doleman,
• alias Parſons.*

50. **T**He inquirie is, whether *Doleman*, alias *Parſons* held
“it to be a damnable ſinne for any of his Catholicks
“to ſuffer any Proteſtant Prince to ſucceede in the Crowne.
This is your owne caſe, M. *Parſons*, and it wil therefore concerne you much to make vp a ſtraight Reckoning, if you will free your intention from Treason. Your Anſwere in your
“*Mitigation* was this. *Is there any word peculiar of a Prote-*
“*ſtant Prince, or of his ſucceſſor? Nay, doth not the text ſpeake*
“*plainely of making a King where none is, &c. How then can*
“*this malicious cauelling Miniſter, &c.* This you ſpake in your leſſe temperate moode: but ſince I haue told you that
“the materiall ſubiect of that Booke, was the *ſucceſſion* to
“the Crowne of England, after the deceaſe of *Queene ELIZABETH*, where you ſpake expreſſly of an *Heire apparent*, and in particular and by name tooke exception againſt our now Gracious Soneraigne King *IAMES*, to debarre him from the inheritance of *Great Brittain*: I muſt expect of you a more ſolemne account.

o Preamb. pa. 22

p Mitig. cap. 2.
pag. 72.

1 Preamb. pa. 23

(a) M. PAR-

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reckon. pa. 51.
num. 82. and pa.
263. where he
calleth this the
eleuenth.

His last words (*Of damnable Sinner*) were spoken as well against Catholics, as Protestants, and meant more principally of Election, then of Succession.

The Reuerie.

M. Parsons re-
lenteth some-
what from his
former Tenet.

51. Mr. Parsons in his *Mitigation* would not be knowne to haue meant any more then of making a King by Election: Now hee is brought to confesse that hee vnderstood it (although lesse Principally) of *Succession also*. Which I confesse is a more *sober Reckoning*. Now yet whereas there is as good a right for an heire to succeed in the Crowne, as there is for a King to possesse it, M. Parsons reason of not making or admitting the right heire apparant (who, by the lawes of England, is King immediatly after his Predecessor hath yeelded vp his last breath) did necessarily inferre, that he meant indeed by *not making* to marre a King, which I prooued by a Syllogisme, which did sufficiently manifest his meaning. *viz.*

Treamb. pa. 24

“*Maior*. Euery man is a damnable Sinner, who admitteth any to the Crowne, whom he thinketh faultie in Religion:

“*Minor*. But euery Romish Catholicke, (in the opinion of M^r. Parsons) thinketh all Protestant Princes faultie in Religion:

“*Ergo*. Euery Romish Catholicke, who admitteth a Protestant to succcede in the Crowne, is (in the opinion of M. Parsons) a damnable Sinner. Let vs, if you please, Reckon likewise for this.

M^r. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reckon. pa. 54.

ALL this Syllogisme, I say, is as well verified of Protestants as Catholics, and consequently the force of this Argument, concludeth nothing at all against vs, more then against himselfe and his. For as for the *Maior* proposition, no Protestant of sense, I thinke, but will grant, that it is a damnable sinne to admit any Prince, if it lie in his hand to preferre or hinder, whom he thinketh to bee faultie in Religion, for that otherwise we must say that Protestants haue no Conscience concerning Religion, if they will aduance wittingly any one, that will

will in their opinion destroy the same. And then I make the *Minor*, But every true Protestant thinketh Romish Catholicks faultie in Religion: Ergo, euery true Protestant that admitteth a Catholicke Prince to succede in the Crowne, is a damnable sinner. And then what shall we say of the Dolphine of France, when he commeth to yeeres to succede in that Crowne, after the death of the King his Father? Will the Protestants receiue him, or no?

The Reuerſe.

52. The *Maïor* was indeed propounded generally, but according to the euident scope of that booke of *Dolman*, it was intended only against Protestants: for their *Dolman* (alias Mr. *Parsons*) himselfe, being of the Romane Religion, did professe it to bee a damnable sinne to admit of King *Iames*, and so of other Protestant Princes, notwithstanding the right of their inheritance, to succede in the Crowne, which is all that I haue affirmed of *Dolman*, for the which notwithstanding he hath made so lowde and a lewde clamor, saying, *How is this fellow to be trusted in these his Assertions, &c.* But yet now graunteth in effect my former Assertion.

53. True it is, that in electing a King a man is bound in conscience to vse his libertie for the good of religion: but religion it selfe teacheth vs that in admitting a *Successor*, (who according to the lawes of that Kingdome hath a right vnto the Crowne) the libertie of election ceaseth, and the necessitie of admittance (by the doctrine of Protestants) is layd vpon vs, be the partie neuer so aduerse vnto vs in faith; as it appeared in their admittance of the now King of France, even when he reuolted from their Religion, whom the Romanists would not admitt, whilest that he was a Protestant in profession. And this difference of comparison, betweene Protestants and Romanistes, will continue vntill the Romanistes haue taken out this Lesson of Primitiue and Catholicke Doctrine, to witte; *Diversity of Religion doth not change the naturall right of Inheritance*, which Rule preuailed in the most pure times, (as *Barkley* their owne Doctor proo- neth) even when Christians were winnowed and purged with persecution, at what time the Apostle exhorted them, saying, * *Let every Soule be Subiect vnto the higher powers.*

(a) 2

And

Difference be-
tweene Electi-
on and Suc-
cession.

† *Barkley* in
two Bookes,
the one *Contra*
Monarchomachos
The second,
De potestate Pa-
pæ, handleth
this at full, and
concludeth ex-
pressely against
the Doctrine
of the Iesuites.
See also the
confession of
others, *Full sa-*
tisfact. part. 3.
cap. 8 &c.
* *Rom.* 13.

And Euen then (saith your *Cumers*,) when the *Martyrs*, by reason of their multitude, were able to conspire against their *Persecutors*, yet chose they rather to suffer for the obedience and honour, which they were commaunded to performe unto *Kings*, then to resist, if it happned that they could not saue themselves by flying. This was the true victorie of Christians. There is one thing more which you will haue me Reckon for.

*M. PARSONS Reckoning, in Charging his
Aduersarie.*

Reckon. pag. 51.

AND to prooue this to bee an exaggeration, That all *Priests* doe viterly abolishe the *Succeſſion* in all *Protestant Princes*, I alleadged contrarie examples in all the *Protestant Princes*, that euer succeeded in England since the beginning of the world, who are knowne to bee but three in number, *King Edward*, *Queene Elizabeth*, and *King James*, who were admitted both by *Priests* and *Lay-men*: Ergo, all *Priests* doe not viterly abolishe all *Succeſſion*, in all *Protestant Princes*, &c. And consequently, some moderation must be graunted on our side, against this odious exaggeration.

*A Reniewe, shewing how M. Parsons is fettered
in his owne Assertions.*

*His craftie
concealement.*

A Simile.

Preamb.

*u Mitig. pag 77.
num. 12.*

54. Is this an honest kind of Reckoning, to tell what you alleaged and to conceale what I replied? namely, that it is a fillie sophistrie for you, in a question of right, to oppose for your discharge only a matter of fact, which is no better reasoning then to say that certaine Robbers were honest and quiet Subiects, because they suffered three stronger men then themselves to passe securely on the way: For you know *M. Parsons*, that your not resisting, where you want force, is done with that reseruatiō (as your *Doctōrs* haue taught) *Vntill there be sufficient force to resist*. Otherwise tell me, I pray you, when you obiect that *three Protestant Princes* were admitted peaceably, How is it (which you could not denie) that *Henry King of Nauarre* was resisted, lest that comming to the Crowne of France in that disposition, wherein he was presumed to bee, (namely a *Protestant*) hee should attempt the change of Religion in that great Kingdome? Here the case of Religion.

Religion (we see) was the same in K. Edward of England, and King Henry of France, and yet behold, *resisting* the one, and *not resisting* the other: Can you imagine any other reason of this difference, but the having and not having of *Power* to resist? Therefore in this Reckoning you have beene wisely craftie, by concealing an Obiection, which you could not satisfie.

55. I doubt I shall but trouble you in asking you another Question, but you must pardon me, for the cause it selfe doth challenge thus much. The *three* Protestant Princes, *who were* (as you say) *so peaceably admitted to the Crowne*; were they admitted voluntarily on your part, or no? If they were admitted voluntarily, then (by your owne former Doctrine, M. Parsons) all your Catholickes *were damnable sinners, who admitted any to the Crowne, whom they thought to be of a faultie Religion*: If they were not voluntarily admitted, then are you a fraudulent *Equivocator*, in answering that *They were admitted peaceably*, (reserving, as it may seeme, in your minde) because our Catholickes had no power to resist. Wee draw to a conclusion.

A Dilemma.

See above.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Wherefore to come to knit vp this Reckoning briefly with M. Morton, we see first that he hath not beene able exactly to verifie any one of his two former propositions out of his owne Syllogisme, concerning *Dolemans* Assertion, but that he hath vsed exaggeration and calumny in them both, and that whatsoever he hath yrred neuer so boldly to incite his Maiestie against vs, may with much more reason and force of argument, bee retorted against himselfe and his.

Reckon. pag. 53.

The Reuiew, confuting M. Parsons from the iudgement of his fellow Priest.

56. I haue bin earnestly and sharply censured by M. Parsons as *one false, calumnious, and malicious*, because I noted his booke, which he named *Dolman*, to be a Treatise, very seditious and rebellious, and (as though he, goodman, had meant nothing but well therein) he durst in his *Mitigation*:

(a) 3 pleade:

pleade for his *Dolman*, and now againe forbeareth not to reuiue the iustification of that booke in this his newe *Reckoning*; Albeit he could not be ignorant of the iudgment, which one Romish Priest with the consent of many moe had passed vpon him: *Parsons his bookes* (saith he) *were seditious, as his Philopater, speaking most rebelliously against her Maiestie, and the whole State and Nobles of this land; his Dolman intitling most trayterously the Spanish Infanta to the English Crowne.* Thus we see his will was extremely *Trayterous*.

¹ *Quodlib.* p. 107
and againe,
pag. 310.

M. *Parsons* false
and treaso-
nable dealing,
discouered by
his owne fel-
low.

² *Quodlib.* p. 186.

M. *Parsons* can
denie his owne
writing.

57. The same Authour dooth furthermore display a fine peece of witt-craft, which M. *Parsons* vseth to practise. *In the most of Father Parsons seditious bookes, which he hath published, (saith the same Priest) he hath eyther concealed his name; or giuen the such a name, as pleased him to deuise: and one of his said bookes being set out by him under the name of M. Dolman: Now that many exceptions are taken against it hee (Goodman) was not the Author of it, his name is not Dolman, and gladly would he shift and wash his hands of it, but all the water betwixt this and Rome will not serue his turne so to doe, although by the common opinion of the Iesuits, he may by lying and Equiuocating make a faire shew.* So their Priest. And now I offer the matter to our indifferent Readers to iudge, whether Mr. *Parsons*, being thus blazoned by their owne Priest, as a man notably *Seditious* (euen in their booke called *Dolman*) and a lying *Equiuocator*, may be thought to haue beene eyther in answering and qualifying of the objected rebellious position, a iust *Mitigator*; or else in this booke a conscionable *Reckoner* in charging me with falshood.

S E C T. XIII.

The thirteenth charge against Mr. Parsons; concerning Pope Gregory 7. alias Hildebrand, the first Pope that deposed an Emperour, from the testimony of Otto Frisingensis.

“ 58. I^a Said in the Text that Gregory the seventh was the ^{a Preamb. p. 27.}
 “ first Pope, who deprived any Emperour of his regiment,
 “ as saith your Otto Frisingensis: Adding in the Margent, Ut
 “ refert Tolossanus, that is, According as he is alleadged by To-
 “ lossanus. Mr. Parsons supposing that the testimony of Otto
 “ Frisingensis is alleadged contrary to his meaning, noteth me
 for the falsificator, whereas not I, but their owne Romish
 Doctor Tolossanus was the reporter of the testimony of Fri-
 singensis. I would onely know whether it were not a maliti-
 ous tricke in M. Parsons to charge me with the error (if yet it
 were an errour) of my Authour Tolossanus?

*The summe of Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning, in
 the discharge of himselfe.*

IN the English Text, which was written for the deceiuing of the Eng-
 lish common reader, was nothing layd at al of Tolossan^a, but thus in dis-
 grace of Pope Gregory the seventh. I reade and reade again (saith your Otto
 Frisingensis) and I finde that Pope Gregory the seventh called Hildebrand
 in the yeare 1060. was the first Pope that ever deprived any Emperour of his
 Regiment. Onely in the margent he setteth downe in Latine the words
 of Frisingensis, with cyting the booke and Chapter, and then addeth, Ut
 refert Tolossanus lib. 26. ^{Reckon. pa. 61.}

The Reueiwe.

59. That is to say in plaine English, that not I, but Tolossanus
 cyted Frisingensis contrary to his meaning: And so is Mr.
 Parsons found to haue falsified in accusing me of falshood. And
 now consider (good Reader, I pray thee) that he hath no co-
 lour for the excuse of his former slander and errour, but to
 say that the reported Authour Frisingensis was in the text, to
 deceive <sup>M Parsons, a
 plaine falsifier.</sup>

His childish
excuse.

deceive the English Reader, and that *Tolossanus* the reporter was set downe in Latine in the margent: which any man of *Sobriety* would be ashamed to alleadge, for were not *Frisingenis* and *Tolossanus* both Latine Authours, and therefore indifferently knowne and vnknowne to the English Reader? How then can this excuse Mr. *Parsons* fraudulency, for he vnderstood that these Latine wordes, which were set downe in the margent, viz. *Et refert Tolossanus*, do signifie (being Englished) *As Tolossanus reporteth*: so that the very childishnesse of this excuse of his false dealing, doth more fully bewray both his folly and falshood.

^b *Frising. Chron.*
lib. 6. cap. 35.

60. As for me, I could not thinke it necessary to seeke for *Frisingenis*, when I had at hand so good a Reporter, as is their owne Doctor *Tolossanus*: and yet when al is said, ^b*Frisingenis* saith, that that Pope *Gregory* the seventh was the first who either excommunicated or deposed an Emperour.

*Mast. Parsons charge against me, about
the same matter.*

^a *Preamb. quo
supra.*

61. In the second part I am chargeable to answer *Mast. Parsons*, who asketh, that seeing *Tolossanus* said that *Gregory* "the seventh was the first who excommunicated, and deprived
"an Emperour of his Regiment, why I alleadged the word De-
"prived onely, and left out Excommunicated? I readily answered that it was because the question (*Satisfact. 3. c. 11.*) was
"onely concerning Emperours and Kings, who had bene de-
"posed from their governments by Popes, and not, who had been
"excommunicated: And for so answering am called to a new
Reckoning.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reckon. p. 64.

Yea Sir, thinke you to escape so? and yet know that deposition of Princes is an effect of Excommunication, and can neuer happen by Ecclesiasticall authoritie, but where Excommunication is gone before?

The

The Renewe.

62. Yes Sir, I may lawfully answer *So*. For although *Excommunication* goe before *deposition* and Eradication, yet was it lawfull for me to intreat of *Deposition*, without mentioning any precedent *Excommunication*. For if being asked how many theeves were hanged at *Tiburne* the last weeke, I had truly answered *siue*; forthwith some captious Constable should quarrell with me, saying, *Yea Sir*, dare you say so? will you tell vs that any were hanged, without mentioning that first they were condemned, for condemnation goeth before execution? Euen so childishly hath *Mastr. Parsons* cauilled in earnest, who still holdeth on his pace.

His absurd
reasoning.

A Simile.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

AND I would aske *M. Marton* in good earnest out of his Diuinity, when a Christian Prince is lawfully Excommunicated, and shut out from all societie of Christian communion, and he persist impenitent, how can he be head of a Christian Common-wealth, for so much as he is no member, nor hath any place, or part at all in the whole body, the head-ship being the chiefe part of all others?

Reckm.p. 64.

*A Renew, discovering the rebellious humour
of M^r. Parsons.*

63. If *Mastr. Parsons* had not asked me in earnest, I might haue taken him to haue bene but in iest: but now by this his serious demaund, our Christian Reader will easily perceiue, that he hath cast *Diuinity* in a new mould: for a King, by his doctrine, cannot be *Excommunicated*, but forthwith hee must as it were be *be-headed*, and remoued from his Kingdom: we now haue found out the whole portraiture of *M. Parsons* body by his finger, which writeth and teacheth; at *A King persisting in Excommunication may bee no more a King among Christians*. No King, or Queene, or Prince, or Counsellour, or Iudge, or Magistrate, being excommunicate, may, by *Mastr. Parsons* censure, haue any communion among Christians, but

M. Parsons will
needes behead
a King, whom
he accounteth
an Hereticke.

A necessary
obseruation,
concerning
Excommuni-
cation and E-
radication.

(b)

must

muſt be rooted out. Behold our Romiſh *Muſigator* ! Behold our *Sober Reckoner* ! Doth not this ſmell ſtrongly of fire and Gun-powder, whenſoeuer opportunity ſhal ſerue for the performance of ſuch their exploits ?

^d M. Blackwell
exam. pag. 41.
from Medina
in prima ſecunda
p. 513. q. 96 art. 4
M. Parſons fully
confuted by
his fellowes.
• Ludovic. A-
polog. p. 175.

64. But to anſwere directly to the queſtion, moued by M. Parſons, not from his owne doubt, but for his Readers deluſion; becauſe otherwiſe hee could not be ignorant, that their Arch-Prieſt M. Blackwell had answered that point to the full, ^d ſhewing firſt out of *Soto*, from *Medina*, that *Excommunication* is not a priuation of any proper good, which the tranſgreſſor doth poſſeſſe, but of the common good, which he was to receiue from the Church, as namely, the ſpiritual communion with them, and the participation of Sacraments.

65. Secondly he alleadgeth *Ludonicus Richeome*, a Ieſuite, ſaying that *Excommunication* is not thundered againſt Princes, that they ſhould be remoued out of their Dominions, or that the raiues ſhould be looſed vnto ſubiects, or they be freed from the Oath of fidelity.

^f Aquin ſecunda
ſecunde. q. 11.
art. 3.

66. Thirdly, he adioyneth the teſtimony of *Aquinas*, ſaying ^f *Aliud eſt Excommunicatio, & aliud Eradicatio*; Which, (ſaith M. Bl.) is ſet down in the Canon law of an Epistle of Pope *Vrbane*, thus: *Liquido, &c.* that is, It doth plainly appeare that *Excommunication* is one thing, and eradication is another, for he which is excommunicate, as the Apoſtle ſaith, to this end is excommunicated, that his ſoule may bee ſaued in the day of the Lord, for *Excommunication* is a correction and no extirpation.

^{* Matth. 18. 17.}

67. Finally, the holy Scripture, ſpeaking of the Excommunicate, ſaith: ^{*} *Let him be vnto thee as a Publicane and an Ethnickes*. I demand then, was there no Magiſtracy acknowledged in *Ethnickes*, by Chriſtians in the dayes of the Emperour *Iulian* the Apoſtata? or ſhall not Chriſtian children or wiues acknowledge naturall duety vnto their Parents and husbands, as vnto their Heads, if they being excommunicate, ſhall proue contumacious? Grace doth not extinguiſh nature, but perfect it. And this may briefly ſerue for an Anſwere vnto your irrelegious and rebellious demaund, which hath beene exactly confuted by your owne Doctōrs.

M. Parſons

M^r. PARSONS his Reckoning.

ANd *Tolosanus* here alleadged by Mr. *Morton* produceth in another example both of Excommunication and of deposition about an hundred yeares before this of *Frisingenis*, saying, *Anteq̃ uide[m] Gregorius tertius. &c.* Before this, *Gregory* the third beeing made Pope vpon the yeare 759. did deprive *Leo* the third Emperour of Constantinople, both of his Empire, and the communion of Christians, for that he had cast holy Images out of the Church, and defaced them, and held a wicked opinion against the blessed Trinity. And that *Tolosanus* in this faith truth, is testified also by *Zonaras* a Greeke Historiographer in the life of the said Emperour *Leo Isaacus*.

Reck. p. 64. & 65

Tolos. de rep. l. 6.
c. 13. & 20.

The Reuerie.

68. *Tolosanus* in another booke reporteth this, and *Zonaras* testifieth this, *Ergo*, (by Mr. *Parsons* his consequence) it must be *True*: which argueth his owne inconsideration and rashnesse, because first the matter is not so true, but that their owne & *Barkley* durst iudge it incredible: and secondly their witnesse *Zonaras* seemeth to their^h *Baronius* to be so insufficient, in reporting the behauour of this Pope *Gregory* towards the Emperour *Leo*, that he reiecteth him as a man Ignorant of the affaires of the Latine Church; and one, who in Malice against the Church of Rome, doth obiekt that the Pope was the cause of the rent of the Empire in the West. Thus farre *Card. Baronius*: which sheweth how little we are to regard M. *Parsons* his iudgement, who respecteth not so much how rightly, as how readily hee may shape vs an Answer. And that *Gregory* the seventh called *Hildebrand*, was the first Pope, who set the Emperours at such defiance, it will now further appeare.

s Barclay de
pote state Pope
cap 40.h Baron Ano.
726. num. 26.
M. Parsons neg-
ligence in
Storie.

S E C T. XIII.

An Inquiry into the iudgement of *Espencæus*, concerning
the case of Pope *Hildebrand*.

69. **T**HE last point, which is to be inquired into, is, whether the Authour *Espencæus* did not accord
(b 2) vnto

i Preamb. p. 39.

vnto the same iudgement concerning *Gregory the seventh* (who, to yeelde vnto *M. Parsons* computation, was Pope about the yeare 1066.) to thinke that he was the first Pope that did depose an Emperour.

The summe of M^r. PARSONS his Reckoming, obiecting fraude vnto his Adversary.

Reckon. pag 66. & 67.

Espen. l. 2. Digress in Ep. ad Timoth

**Reckon. p. 67. & in Espen. cap. 6. p. 274. Edit. Paris 1561.*

**Reckon. ibid.*

Espencus heere is handled iniuriously and fraudulently, for that these wordes against the Pope, are not the wordes of *Espencus* himselfe, but related of him out of an angrie and passionate Epistle, written by certaine Schismaticall Priests of Liege, that were commanded by Pope *Paschalis* to be chastised by *Robert Earle* of Flanders, for their rebellious behauior, in the yeare 1102. which Priests, together with *Henry* the Schismaticall Bishopp, wrote a passionate inuective against this acte and Commission of Pope *Paschalis*, inueighing against Pope *Hildebrand* (who was not long before deceased) for the like cause, All which *M. Morton* concealeth, and cyteth the wordes of *Espencus* himselfe. *Towr B. shop Espen.* (saith he) writeth of *Hildebrand*, &c. which he could not but know to be false, if he read the booke and place by himselfe cyted, for that *Espen.* doth not onely in the beginning of his citation vse this sentence, *Extat in secundo Tomo Conciliorum Edit. Colon. Cleri Leodiensis ad Pascalem 2. Querimonia*; There is extant in the second Tome of Councils, a complaint of the Clergie of Liege to Pope *Paschalis* 2. But in the end also of al his speech, which containeth a long Discourse, he concludeth thus, *Hactenus Leodiensium & verba & ensa. &c.* And presently for himselfe saith, that he wil not meddle with the Controuersie of fighting betweene Popes and Emperours. * Now for *M. Morton* to come and auouch this as affirmed by *Espencus*, whereas he must needs know that he saith it not, but relateth it onely out of others. without approouing the same, is to adde preuarication vnto preuarication, and neuer to make an end of wilfull lying.

The Reueiwe.

70. Let me entreate your patience, *Mr. Parsons*, but to heare my answer, and then I doubt not but you will waxe more calme and sober, and consequently a farre fitter Reckoner, to see more clearly, whether of vs is the true liar.

71. You haue said that *Espencus* did but onely relate it, and not approue of it. You may not now fetch skippes as you vse to doe, to escape from your owne sayings; Heare now the wordes

wordes of ^k *Esperians*: He, speaking of the same Epistle of the Clergie-men of *Liege*, beginneth thus: *Querimonia gravitatis & subiectionis plena*, that is, *A complaint* (saith *Esperians*) full of gravity and of subiection. Neyther could you be ignorant of these wordes, for they goe immediately before the words which you haue mentioned out of *Esperians*. Hath hee then onely related it (good Sir,) hath he not also commended it?

^k *Esperians* in the very same place, which *M. Parsons* hath cyted.
M. Parsons palpable vntruth.

72. *Esperians* proceedeth to shewe the cause of the displeasure of Pope *Paschalis* against them. *Quod, &c.* That is, *Because they were obedient vnto their Bishop Henry, who stucke vnto the Emperour.* In the end, *I forbear* (saith *Esperians*) to use any discourse about the temporall contentions, which fell betwene the Popedome and the State imperiall from that time, (Marke, I pray you, when) *even after a thousand and an hundred yeares after Christ.* Hee meant therefore to note his beginning of the Papall turbulency to haue beene at that time. May not now *M. Parsons* perceiue how bolde he hath beene with himselfe, to affirme that *Esperians* did not approoue the Epistle of those Priests, but seemed rather to hold them *Schismaticall*? And how to this end he quoted the Author, booke, digression, page, place, and time of impression, as though hee had studied to set himselfe vpon a publique Stage of reproach for his open leesing? Which that my Reader may know to be spoken of me in true sobriety, I propound further vnto him the expresse iudgement of the same *Esperians* out of two places of his workes.

73. The first place is in the 1 page going immediately before, where comparing the more auncient times of the Church with the latter, concerning the Clergies disposition to war-fare in their owne persons, saith thus: *Et tales quidem fuerunt in vtroq; Dei populo. Sacerdotum inermium & pacificorum erga seculi Dominos fideles & infideles, mites & barbaros victoria non minus gloriose quā incruent a, &c. j. c.* such indeed were the victories of unarmed and peaceable Priests among both sort of people (namely of the olde and new Testament) towards their temporall Lords, whether they were faithfull, or Infidels, gentle or barbarous: Which their victories were no lesse glorious, then vn-

¹ Pag. 173. of his booke aboue cyted.

Bloody Popes.

bloody: Namely, atchieued by teares and Prayers: But what afterward? *Quibus, &c.* For after that lawlesse necessitie had exercised not only the minde, but also the hand of the Cleargie to fight, it came to passe that they, with time (which corrupteth all things) did play their part, as soone as they had aduoynd vnto ministeriall places secular Seignories, and that some lesse peaceable Vicars of our Lord God, did wage Warre not onely against the Barbarous, but euen against the Princes of the same blood, sometime of the same Countrey, yea and of the same faith, giving examples full of infinite scandals, and no way warrantable by any Scriptures or Canons. And then beginning at the yeere 770. when Adrian and other Popes raised Warre against the Saracens and Lombards, he descended vnto Pope Vrbane the second, who although he would not iudge them to bee murderers, (speaking of Ecclesiasticall men) who had killed certaine Excommunicate persons, yet did he inioyne them Penance. And at length he fasteneth vpon the foresaid Epistle of the Priests of Liege vnto Paschale the second, condemning the practise of Hildebrand, alias, Gregorie the seuenth, which Epistle hee commended, as we haue heard. Hee hath compared former vnarmed Bishops, with the Souldierly Romish Popes of after-times, and iudgeth the ancient sort peaceable, and the other to haue caried themselues after an heathenish and slanderous manner.

74. Therefore (M. Parsons) when you say that *Espeuans* did onely relate the passion of other men against Pope Gregorie: Good Sir (to returne your owne Rhetoricke vpon you) will you stand vnto this? Is it true? Is this sincere, seeing that *Espeuans* both condemneth all such bloody Prelates, and approoueth of the Epistle of those Priests against Gregorie himselfe? Is this good dealing? Nay is it not altogether perfidious?

75. Elsewhere the same Author *Espeuans* expresseth his iudgement more fully, concerning this point of Subiection, saying that *The Apostle doth teach all the faithfull to be subiect vnto the powers, saying, [Let every soule be subiect, &c.] that is, as Chrysostome speaketh, Whether Prophet, or Apostle, or Bishop, let him be subiect: And accordingly doeth Euthymius, Theod.*

^m *Espeu. Comm.*
in Tit. 3. 1. Di-
grest. 10. pa. 513.
Paris. 1568.

Theod. Theoph. and other Greeke Fathers teach: And Saint Bernard doth collect as much out of the same sentence, [Let every soule, &c.] When, writing vnto the Archbishop of Sans, he saith; Be you subiect also, hee that offereth to exempt you, doeth offer to tempt and deceiue you. Thus farre *Espeuau*.

The former Assertion, concerning Gregorie the seuenth, confirmed by the testimonie of their owne Archpriest, and others.

75. ^a M. Blackwel your late Archpriest, alleadged to the same purpose Bish. *Vincentius* (who receiued his testimonie from *Sigebert*, Anno 1088.) saying (with relation vnto Gregorie the seuenth, and to him who succeeded next but one, to wit, *Vrbannus*.) *Vi pace, &c.* That is, That I may speake it (saith he) with the fauour of all good men, *Hæc sola non ita, nè dicam hæresis*; That is, This meere noueltie, that I say not Heresie, was not as yet sprung in the world, that the Priests of him, who saith vnto the King [Apostata,] and who maketh the Hypocrite to Raigne for the sinnes of the people, should teach Subiects that they owe no subiection vnto wicked Kings, that albeit they haue taken an Oath of fidelitie vnto such an one, yet they are not bound in Allégeance vnto him, and that such as should take part against their Kings, may not be said to be periured: So he.
^o Barkley out of *Otto Frisingensis* defendeth that, There is not found any example of deposing an Emperour of his State in any age, before Gregorie the seuenth. Which made their late Pope *P Paulus*, to acknowledge no violence vsed by any Pope, vntill A thousand yeeres after Christ. At what time There were not wanting some (saith Cardinall *q Cusanus*) yea, even among the Cardinals, besides a Councell at Rome, who defended Henry the Emperour from the Excommunication of *Hildebrand*.

^a Exam. pag. 54.

^o Barcla. De pot. Pope. cap. 9.

^p Apologia. P. Pauli. S. Videre non. pag. 624.
^q Cusanus Card. Concord. Cathol. l. 3. c. 41. pag. 823

77. I forbear to vrge the Epistles of the Priests of Leige, which M. Parsons calleth a *Pasionate inuective* against Pope *Paschalis*; Lest it might driue the old man into passion. Albeit, whosoever shall Reade that *Epistle*, hee shall find the commendation of *Espeuau* to be most true, who calleth it *A*

com-

complaint full of grannie, &c. Hee might further haue added, and of Religious pietie. But Mr. *Parsons* hath not yet done with *Espencæus*.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reckon pag 67.

YET *Espencæus* prooueth by sundry examples out of Scriptures, Fathers, and Councels, that in some cales it is lawfull for Priests to vse Temporall Armes also.

The Renewe.

Ibid. pag. 275.

78. It is true, and amongst others, he produceth the example of *Dudechine*, a Priest, who went to Warre against the Turke, with *Conrade* the third, and of *Turpinus* Bishop of Rheimes, who warred vnder *Charles the Great*, and of *Delbodus*, who tooke Armes against the Sarracens vnder *Henry* the Emperour. All these, in their Warres, stood with their Emperours, none is found to haue caried Armes against their Emperours: Therefore this obseruation, which *M. Parsons* vseth, seemeth very idle, except it be to bewray his owne disposition (whom their Priest hath noted to bee of *A furious, chollericke, and passionate humour*) in desiring, like a tall Souldier, the vse of a lacke and a Speare.

M. Parsons his
militarie Dis-
cipline.

Quodlib. p. 236

His manifold
vntruethes.

79. By this Reckoning it appeareth, that *M. Parsons* is become a fower-fold Debter, First, vnto the State, by his Treasonable Doctrine, in teaching an eradication of Princes Excommunicate: Secondly to himselfe, by a wilfull falsifying of the iudgement of *Espencæus*: Thirdly vnto me, by foylting vpon me the related Historian *Frisingensis*, instead of the Relator *Tolosanus*, with a malicious purpose to proue me a falsifier: Lastly, to the cause it selfe, in not acknowledging the noueltie of their new Doctrine of *Deposing of Kings and Emperours*.

*Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning, in censuring
of Espencæus.*

Reckon *ibid.*

CLAUDIUS *Espencæus* was a Parisian Doctor, and a Writer of small account, whom he calleth a Bishop, but I neuer heard of his Bishoppricke.

The

*The Renewe, shewing the Eclipse of M. Parsons
his iudgement in this censure.*

80. Mr. Parsons is fallen forth with *Espencaus*, and good reason, for he saw right well that *Espencaus* doeth, in effect, call the Doctrine of M. Parsons and his fellows, *Rebellious*: and therefore now must he be esteemed *A writer*, but of *small account*. Wherein our Reader may obserue, what *small account any man is to make of M. Parsons his iudgement*, who Reading *Espencaus*, doeth so greatly debase him, especially seeing that their owne learned Authors haue afforded him a better approbation: For *Espencaus* is called by *Medina* (saith *Cumel*) *A most learned man*; whom Cardinall^u *Bellarmino* himselfe vsith to alleadge among your Doctors of account. And *Espencaus* himselfe can further assure vs, with a protestation of trueth, that when he was in possibilitie to bee chosen a *Cardinall*, he thanked God that he missed it, concluding with this Epiphonema; *Quid Roma faciam, mentiri nescio?* That is, *What shall I doe at Rome, seeing I cannot lie?* Doe you heare this, M. Parsons? We know where your dwelling is, and your Booke sheweth you in euery Page to bee truly *Romish*: So hard a thing it is for you to tell a perfect trueth. The last Charge will require a Chapter of it selfe.

^u Cumel. Tom. 3.

^u ar. Disp. pag.

131. Col. 1.

^u Bellarm. l. 1. de

Cleric. c. ap. 22.

^u Espenc. Epist.

Dedic. ad Card.

Castilanté Sex

Tract.

CHAP. XIII.

*Contayning the last charge of falsitie against M. Parsons,
about the iudgement of Romish Writers, concerning
Mentall Equiuocation; conteyning a large Discourse
hercof from their doctrine.*

SECT. I.

First in generall.

I.
“
“



Ast. Parsons his falsitie^a was the imputing vn-
to me an acknowledgement of the *Vnnerfall*
use of *Mentall Equiuocation* in the space of
four hundred yeares.

^a Preamb. p. 12.

& Mitigat. pag.

279. & 281. &

284.

(c)

Mr. Par-

MR. PARSONS *his Reckoning.*

Reckon. cap. 4.
§. 11. pag. 265.

First, I said no more in my Treatise, then that Mr. *Morton* had manifestly set downe, that for these last 400. yeares he graunted the lawfulness of Equiuocation to haue bin taught in our Schooles. And conſults (saith he) with the auacient Logicians from the beginning of the world, till within the compasse of these last 400. yeares, and lesse, that euer any Logician did allow your mixt proposition, partly mentall, and partly verball, and I will &c. Out of which exception, for these last 400. yeares, it is evidently deduced, that he granteth the vse of such mixt propositions (which are properly Equiuocations) whereof the one part is vttered, the other reserved in mind, as before hath beene declared. And thereof I inferred further by evident consequence, and sequell of reason (though he specified not the same) that for so much as our Catholicke Schooles were then ouer all Christendome, and none publicly knowne or in vse but they, (for those three hundred, or at least these foure) it must needs follow that the same doctrine, during that time, was generally receiued in the said Schooles, Vniuersities, &c.

The Review.

M. Parsons hath
lost his logicke

2. Here is new Logique, which Maſt. *Parsons* hath sent vs from Rome ouer the Alpes, to wit, *Mentall Equiuocation was not vsed before the last 400. yeares, Ergo, In the last 400. yeares it was vsed Vniuersally in all Vniuersities, Chaires, Schooles; by al Diuines, Casuists, &c.* This he calleth an evident deducement; he should rather haue said an impotent *Seducement*, for so it is; and all one as to reason thus: the Moone was not this yeare in the Eclipse, before the last moneth, *Ergo*, it was in the Eclipse euery week, euery day, & euery houre of the last moneth, which is most ridiculous. *Ex nihilo nihil fit* (*M. Parsons*) none can euer deduce an affirmatiue conclusion from a negatiue proposition, be then ashamed of your *Evidence*. And so may you be likewise of your next shift, in telling vs that you did not seeme to perswade your Reader *Expressly and by name* that I graunted the generall vse of *Mentall* Aequiuocation in *All Schooles, Chaires Vniuersities, Tribunals, and the like*, for these 400. yeares, but onely by *Consequence*. For what can be more expressly assumed than was this, where you said, "c Seeing it hath beene admitted (say you) so long time in Christen-

^b Reckon ibid.
pag 266.

^c Mitig. p. 284.

"standome, as our aduersaries doe confesse, and that it hath beene
 "received so vniuersally and generally both by Prelates and peo-
 "ple: and if it haue beene so publickly taught by all learned men,
 "and contradicted by none. (This was an Antecedent, and not
 a consequence, for that followeth in the next words:) it ought
 to be a great argument to discrete men, that it hath some ground
 of truth? Neyther is it sufficient to inferre a matter by Conse-
 quence, for the diuell made a consequence when hee said, ^d If
 thou be the Sonne of God, cast thy selfe downe: but this was a
 lying consequence. And what froath, rather then force M. P. ar-
 sons consequence hath, I haue already shewed. In the next
 place we are to discusse the Authours, who seeme to except a-
 gainst M. P. arsons his arte of Acquiucating. ^{d Matth. 4.}

S E C T. II.

*The first Instance of the charge, from their Doctor Sepul-
 ueda, against their Mentall Equiuocation.*

"2. **G**enesius * Sepulveda made against you: what say
 you to him? * Preamb. p. 83.

M^r. PARSONS his Reckoning.

M^r. Morton findeth out but one Authour that contradicted the
 same Equiuocation in all the time by him appointed, euen Ge-
 nesius Sepulveda, and that onely in some particular cases, though
 graunting and defending it in others. ^{Reckon. pa. 267.}

The Review.

3. Here are but two things you wil haue vs to obserue:
 one is, that Sepulveda alloweth *The same* your mentall Equi-
 uocation in some cases; the other is, that this Authour was
 found to be but one: in both which I spie a litter of manifest
 falsities. For first, what is the *Mentall Equiuocation* which you
 defend? tell vs; "It is a mixt proposition (say you) partly uttered
 with my mouth, as [I am no Priest,] and partly reserved in my
 minde, ^{* See aboue.}

minde, as in this clause, [*To tell it unto you.*] But what if this clause be such (for this is the chiefeft point of this whole dispute) as that it will not agree with the outward wordes in the common interpretation, and vse of speecch, as thus; *I am no Priest*, reserving in your minde, *as bound to drive a Cart*? The first part vttered with the mouth, [*I am no Priest*,] can not possibly, in the common apprehension of man, signifie or imply this clause which followeth [*As bound to drive a Cart.*] Doe you thinke then that such a clause (for I shall neede to aske no more) which is not comprehensible by the outward wordes, doth therfore make the outward speecch true, because it is true in the minde of the speaker? * *Yes* (say you) *for that I truly meane that I am no Priest in the sense which I speake it, which may be what pleaseth me.* This being the very Basis and foundation of your doctrine of *Mensall Equivocation*, I now make bold to auerre, that euery such speecch, in the iudgment of *Sepulveda*, is a lie.

* See aboue.

e Sepulveda de ration. dicendi tellimon. cap. 3. pag. 468.

4. For so he censureth euery such kinde of reserved clause, where the *e* obiection is made concerning one, who is called in question by a Iudge to bewray another mans secrecie, which he ought not to reueale, and shall answer thus, [*I know nothing of it.*] keeping this reservation in minde, [*As bound to tell it unto you.*] Here we finde a mixt proposition, part in word, and part in minde; secondly, here the Iudge is incompetent, demanding that which the party is not bound to reueale; thirdly, here your Clause of Reservation is the same, wherein you principally insist: so that if this be not lawfull, you must necessarily faile in your former defence. Come we now to our Authour *Sepulveda*. Vnto this obiection of *Philetus* and *louer of himselfe*, he opposeth his owne iudgement in the name of *Theophilus*, that is, *A loue of God*, saying, *¶ If you Philetus be prepared to answer so, then you tell me in briefe that you are prepared to perire your selfe.* Hercunto *Philetus* replyeth: *I doe not lie, seeing that the reserved Clause, viz. [That I ought to tell it unto you,] agreeth with my minde.* Then *Theophilus* returneth vpon him, saying: *What taught you to trifle so finely? Who did first shew you such a lurking hole for perinrie? And*
in

¶ Ibid. cap. 3. pag. 471.

Sepulveda condemneth Mass. Parsons Equivocation for a lie.

in the end concludeth, concerning the former *Aequiuocation*: That the speech is a lie, because the signification thereof doth dissent from that which lieth secret in the minde: for thou sayest (saith he) that [thou knowest nothing at all thereof] and every one that heareth thee, doth so vnderstand thee, notwithstanding thou art guilty to thy selfe, that thou doost know it, although with purpose not to reueale it.

5. All this you saw, M. Parsons, and therein could not but perceiue that Sepulveda hath flatly contradicted your *Mentall Equiuocation*, notwithstanding haue you dared to say that he doth defend the same in some cases. What shal any man thinke of you, when you talke of *rectitude of conscience*? Certainly this pretence is nothing but a Pharisaicall cleansing, as it were, of the outside of the cuppe: for when we looke within it, there is nothing but foule cob-webs of falshoods and follie.

M. Parsons
wilfull vn-
truth.

6. Although the examination of the former obseruation doth argue a distorted minde in you, yet in the second you do excell your selfe, where you say that I finde but *One Author Sepulveda* contradicting your *Aequiuocation*, especially knowing that if I bring in this *Sepulveda*, then I do not bring him in alone, seeing that he goeth accompanied with all those Authors, vpon whom the same *Sepulveda* doth ground his former conclusion: which I signified vnto you in my 8 *Full Satisfaction*, out of the wordes of *Sepulveda*, saying; But that you may know (saith he) how long it is since that *Comment of Diuines* did preuaile for the excuse of a lie, in bearing false witness in another mans case, I thinke you can finde none before *Gabriel*, who durst publicly defend it, That is, the trick of *Reseruatiō*, for he speaketh of it. He telleth vs furthermore, concerning the same *Equiuocation*, that he found it ^b *Defended by some publique Readers in Spaine*, albeit (saith he) it is condemned by the most auncient and principall *Diuines*: ⁱ *Amongst whom I reckon Aquinas*. As for *Scotus*, he acknowledgeth this denial of *Secrecie* (namely *Equiuocatingly*) to be a sinne, onely he made doubt: whether it be mortall, or veniall. And ^k *Henricus de Gandano*, a most learned man, saith, that in such a case it is lawfull

M. Parsons se-
cond vntruth.

8 *Satisfact. pars.*
3. p. 82. out of
Sepulveda de
rat. dicend. oc-
cultæ ca. 19.

M. Parsons *A-*
equiuocation
not ancient.

^b *Sepulveda* quo
supra in prefat.
Aquinas.

ⁱ *Ibid. cap. 15.*
Scotus.

^k *Ibid. cap. 18.*
Henricus de
Gandano.

¹ Ibid. cap. 19.
Gabriel.

for the Examinee not to answer the Judge at all, but to deny the secrecy, to answer falsely, and by art of wordes to lye (calling Equivocation a lye) he holdeth it unlawfull. ¹ Gabriel himselfe denieth that he can escape the guilt of, at least an officious lye, and therefore a sinne, who useth that artificiall manner of denying with the minde: his reason is, because his wordes are taken according to the common understanding, in the which sense they are not true. Which sentence of Gabriel being true in such a speech made without an oath, how much more true is it, if it be used in an oath? for by an oath an officious lye becommeth pernicious, because of the neglect of the reverence of God, who is witnesse unto a mans oath. Thus farre Sepulveda.

7. Whence we vnderstand the fraudulent dealing, whereunto Mr. Parsons accustometh himselfe, who informed his Reader, that I could find but onely Sepulveda contradicting their Equivocation in all the time appointed, and yet all theie were within the compasse of foure hundred yeeres: Aquinas liuing about the yeere 1210. Scotus Anno 1300. Biel Anno 1462. Henricus de Gandavo Anno 1293. Mr. Parsons hath yet one note more which he would haue obserued. I would pray my Reader not to deny him his best attention.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reckon. Ibid.
pag. 267.

NOte, by the way, the lauish immodestie of M. Morton, citing that learned Doctor Gabriel Biel, out of *Genesius Sepulveda*, by the contemptuous title of *Lewde Sophister*: Whereas Sepulveda, stileth him in the same place, *Theologum Doctissimum*, a most learned Diuine.

The Review.

M. Parsons euident falshood.

8. Then, belike, I haue made Sepulveda call Gabriel a *leude Sophister*: will you be so good as but to looke once againe vnto the place, which is in the Preamble, pag. 83. and I doubt not but you will finde out your owne error, or rather recognize your notable falshood. For I named not Gabriel a *leude Sophister* in citing the testimonie of Sepulveda, but some eight lines after I made bold to censure him so of my selfe, which any one, who is not wittingly captious, will plainly discerne. What then must we note you for, M. Parsons,

sons, for noting this by the way, but a man that was by the way when you made that note.

9. If you further aske me a reason of so censuring *Gabriel*, I shall tell you, he attributeth vnto the power of nature so much, as doth detract from the power of the spirit of Gods grace. If this reason be not sufficient, take an other, viz. Although *Gabriel* held that the Equiuocation aboue mentioned is a lye, and consequently a sinne: yet I thinke^m none before *Gabriel Biel* (saith Sepulueda) durst affirme that a lye, in bearing false witnesse in an other mans behalfe, is excusable. Be he therefore as learned as you wil, yet might he be said to play the part of a *Sophister*, who excused a lye, which none did cuer before him.

^m Sepulueda
quo supra.

SECT. III.

The second instance, against Mentall Equiuocation, is from the iudgment of the Iesuit Azorius in his Instit. Moral. part. 1. lib. 11. c. 4. §. Mea tamen. And upon occasion hereof, the Doctrine of Equiuocation is more exactly examined. First we propound the state of this Question, as it is defined and defended by M. Parsons.

The Charge of T. M. against M. Parsons.

10. **T**He second^a falsity of P. R. is his affirming that
“*Mentall Equiuocation* (for herevpon we only dispute) hath beene *universally* received of all *Vniuersities* and
“*people in Christendome*, and not contradicted by any. The first witnesse conuincing this *Mitigation* of fallhood, is *Azorius*, &c.

^a Preamb. p. 84.

*M. PARSONS his Reckoning, and Charge
against his Aduersarie.*

THe opinion of *Azorius* is falsly objected by *M. Morton*, as making *Reckon. cap. 4.*
for him, whereas it maketh wholly against him. *§. 12. pag. 269.*

The

The Reniewe.

11. Here is a μέγα χάσμα, a maine gulfe of difference betweene our two iudgments. I affirme that *Azorius* doth condemne the *Equiuocation*, which *M. Parsons* hath defended: *M. Parsons* saith that *Azor* hath beene *falsly objected*, and that *he maketh wholly against me*. Vpon this point hath *M. Parsons* diuers times railed vp his most clamorous inuectiues against me, in this his book of *Reckoning*: wil it please thee (gentle Reader) now to audit our accompts?

First, wee are to set downe the state of the Question.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reck. ibid. p. 269.

BVt now let vs see notwithstanding further what *Azorius* saith against *Equiuocation* in generall, for to this effect he is brought in, in this place, as though he held that al *Equiuocation* were to be rejected as lying: for prooffe whereof he citeth two places out of the selfe same leafe and page of *Azorius*.

The Reniewe.

^b *Reck. cap. 9.*

^{pag.} 643.

^a *Preamb. p. 84.*

M. Parsons vn-truth.

12. *All Equiuocation*, *M. Parsons*? thus you say, and therefore put this in the number of my *new and fresh lyes* (as you call them) saying, ^b *Here followeth a notable committion of falsehood against him, for alleaging: Pa. 84. of his Preamble the Iesuit Azorius, as condemning all vse of Equiuocation, &c.* And yet you know that before the propounding of the testimonies of *Azorius*, and other Iesuits, in the very same page of the *Preamble*, I restrained our whole dispute ynto *Mental Equiuocation* only; for hereupon only (saide I) *we dispute*: which word, *only*, was repeated in the *Preamble* more then seauen times; And yet can you with a wide mouth say, (without exception) that I would haue *Azorius* to speake against *All Equiuocation*. Are you not like to make a good end of your *Reckoning*, who haue thus falsified in the beginning?

13. In all disputes it is necessary wee know the point in question: we contend therefore about *Mental Equiuocation only.*

only. It is in the second place as necessary to know,

what is the mentall Equiuocation, which

M. Parsons doth defend.

14. ^a True Equiuocation (saith M. Parsons) may be either ^a Mitig. c. 11.
 "verball, or mentall: Verball is that, when word or speech hath ^a 3. pag. 484.
 "either naturally, or by peculiar custome of particular language
 "two or more significations. This is truely and plainly said of
 the Verball Equiuocation, tell vs as distinctly what the Men-
 tall is. ^o Mentall Equiuocation is, when any speech hath or may ^o Ibidem.
 "have a double sense, not by any double signification or compo-
 "sition of the wordes themselves, but only by some reseruatiō of
 "minde in the speaker, whereby his meaning is made different
 "from that sense, which the wordes that are vttered, doe beare
 "or yeld without that Reseruatiō. Doe not now forget, I pray
 you (M. Parsons) that you distinguish Mentall Equiuocation
 from Verball, by this note, to wit, that the double sense,
 which is in the Mentall Equiuocation, is not in the words
 themselves, but only by some reseruatiō in the mind of the spea-
 ker, which meaning is different from that sense, which the words
 vttered doe beare: very well, we shall afterwards try whether
 Azorius doe iustifie this manner of Equiuocation or no.

15. In the next place, seing that the outward speech, and
 the inward mentall Reseruatiō are so different, we demaund
 whether you thinke the same kinde of Mental Equiuocation
 to be true or no? ⁱ These wordes of a Priest [I am no Priest] ⁱ Mitigat. c. 8.
 "mixed with this reseruatiō [To tell it vnto you] or such like,
 "agreeing with the minde of the speaker, is as true as if the
 "whole proposition were vttered with the mouth without reser-
 "uatiō, thus; I am no Priest, to tell it vnto you. We must re-
 member this also, in discussing the iudgment of Azorius, to
 know whether he did allow that euery such speech, which
 being vttered wholly in the mouth, and agreeing with the
 minde of the speaker, be likewise true, when it is halfe reser-
 ued in the minde of the speaker in the same sense: for if it be
 not equally true, then your mixture cannot qualifie the out-
 ward speech, to make it a perfect truth.

(d)

16. Lastly,

16. Lastly, what kinde of Reseruation will you allow, and before whome? *Reck. pag. 100.* So that the party, to whome the answer is made, be not a competent Iudge; the speaker is free to haue what meaning he list, so that it be true in his owne sense. *Mitigat. p. 344* Although "it agree not with the Hearers understanding; as [I am no "Priest] reseruing in my minde, [such as I should be] or such "like, whatsoeuer it pleaseth me. So he. This last assertion I must naile vnto the hinder part of your head, that you may remember it: Therefore, if it please you, let this be the Reseruation in the minde, [with purpose to tell it vnto you,] and let vs trye whether *Azorius* will condemne this kinde of Reseruation for a lye or no, euen when it is vsed before a Iudge incompetent. Now commeth in the combat: I will be first the party defendand, and answere your charge.

*The summe of Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning,
and charge against his Aduersary.*

Reck. pag. 270.

* *Ibidem. pag.
270. & 271.*

* *Ibid. pag. 271.*

M^r. Morton skipping ouer foure rules *Azorius* vseth, for they make expressly against him, runneth only to the fift and last, whereof he saith, that it bitteth the naile on the head. And is it so, Sr. ? what say you then to the precedent foure ? why say you nothing to them ? what part of the naile doe they hit, if the last only strike the head ? * In the first he resolueth that a Priest may *Equiuocate*, and say he knoweth nothing, when he is demaunded any point about Confession. In the second he resolueth that whensoeuer any man is demaunded by an incompetent Iudge, euen in an oath, whether he hath committed this, or that sinne, he may by *Equiuocation* deny the same euen in an oath. * As if a man be wrongfully compelled by a Iudge to sweare to pay a summe of mony to his Aduersary, he may sweare, though he haue no intention to performe it, as being against law hauing this Reseruation in his mind, that he will pay so much as by law he is bound. And other three or foure such cases are there in the explanation of this Rule.

The Renewe.

*1 Azor Inst. Mor.
Tom. I. l. 11. c. 4.
§. Secunda
Regula.*

17. *Azorius* neuer vseth the name of *Equiuocation*: and in his explanation of his first and second rule, doth fully abandon *M. Parsons* his doctrine of Reseruation, thus: *Ratio vtriusque Regula, &c.* that is: *The reason of both these Rules* (saith

(saith Azorius) is not that which some doe yeeld, saying that it is lawfull, when we sweare, to take the wordes in our sense, which we feine unto our selues, and not in the sense, which the hearers doe vnderstand. Yet is this the reason which M. Parsons hath laid downe, for the defence of his Mental Reseruation before a Iudge incompetent, saying. *I may feigne what I list, although not agreeing with the vnderstanding of the hearer.* But Azorius alleageth a reason against this insatuation. Because (saith he) *whensoever the wordes are of a doubtfull signification, and we are asked any thing against the Law, then it is lawfull for vs to take them in that sense which we like, albeit the hearers doe take them in an other sense.* Which doth againe confute M. Parsons his doctrine: for he defendeth an Amphibologie of speech, which may haue a double sense only by the reseruation in the minde of the speaker, which sense is different from the wordes of the mouth. But Azorius admitteth not any ambiguous or doubtfull sense, which is not incident vnto the outward wordes themselves, and whereof the hearer is not by some outward circumstance of speech, capable and apprehensible.

Azorius his meaning.

18. This may be made plaine by comparing examples together. A Iudge is acquainted with a mans cause, which he is to determine; the party, whose cause it is, commeth to the Iudge for aduise: Now it is knowne that a Iudge is not to giue counsaile in any case, wherein he is to execute the office of a Iudge: yet the party being instant and vrgent, saying, *Sir, doe you not know how I shall free my selfe in this cause;* the Iudge answereth, *Friend, I know nothing of this matter:* meaning, that howsoeuer, as he is a Lawyer, he know his cause, yet now, as a Iudge, he is not to acknowledge it: And this double sense is in the speech it selfe, and, by circumstance of the person, may possibly be apprehended by any discreet hearer: and is to be called a *Verball Equinocation*, according vnto the former definition, which M. Parsons himselfe hath deliuered; and not a *Mental*.

An Example.

19. Such like is the example, which Azorius hath offered concerning a *Priest*, who knoweth some secret reuealed

vnto him in priuate Confession, as he is a Priest, and therefore as a Priest is bound in conscience and by his calling, not to reueale any such secrecie (except the concealement may be pernitiouſly damniſiable vnto perſons, and States, as ſome of them doe hold): In ſuch a caſe *Azorius* ſaith, that hee may anſwere, *I know not, becauſe he knoweth it not but as a Priest*, which is, that *he knoweth it not, to reueale it*: but why? by vertue of an *Onely reſeruation mentall*? (ſo hath *Mr. Parſons* defined): No, but becauſe, as *Azorius* ſaith, *The wordes themſelues*, according to their uſe, haue this ambiguous ſignification in themſelues: ſo that it is not now to be called abſolutely Mentall, but a verball Ambiguity.

*2 Sepulveda de
nat. dicendi te.
ſimon cap. 3.*

20. *Sepulveda* hath made the caſe very cleare, ſhewing that it is allowed by the *common conſent of Chriſtians*, that a Priest, who knoweth the crime of any, as he is a Priest, that is in confession, may not diſcloſe it: then his anſwere, in ſaying *I know not*, doth iſſue from the *common interpretation of the wordes themſelues*, to ſignifie, that he is not to take knowledge of any ſuch matter, to tell it vnto any: which interpretation iſſueth from the outward circumſtance of his calling, becauſe he is a Priest. So that ſtill the oddes betweene *M. Parſons* and *Azorius* is thus much: *M. Parſons* ſpeaketh of an Equiuocation, or ambiguity of ſpeech, which conſiſteth *not in the outward wordes*: but *Azorius* iudgeth contrarily, as wee haue heard, and *M. Parſons* ſhall better ſee, to his no ſmall rebuke, before the end of our Reckoning. After this *Azorius* addeth a third rule.

The ſumme of M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

*Reckon. p. 271.
272.*

BY the third rule he proueth the like in other caſes, as when iniury is offered, to uſe ambiguous wordes, and to take them in our ſenſe, as farre as the wordes will beare: as the wife being asked of her husband, whether ſhe be an Adultreſſe: and of a man fallen into the handes of theeues, &c. and in the caſe of a man demanded whether he came from a place ſuſpected to haue had the plague, &c.

The Renewe.

21. *Azorius* explaneth himſelfe in this third Rule, as in the

the former, saying, that *We may use wordes ambiguous, taking them in our sense, which the wordes themselves will yeelde; and not (as M. Parsons holdeth) in whatsoever sense we list, whereunto our minde shall agree:* which meaning sometime is such, as the diuell himselfe cannot by any circumstance of the speech possibly vnderstand. Such as this is: where a man demanded of his friend, whether he hath any money, to answer no, reseruing in his minde, *To lend it vnto you:* which although it be a true proposition, being deliuered with the mouth, yet spoken halfe in the mouth, and halfe reserued in the minde, doth not make a true proposition, but is a very lie, as *Azorius* hereafter will tell vs; euen because the outward wordes cannot by any congruity of speech import that same Clause, *To lend it vnto you.* And if this shal appear in *Azorius*, it wil be no hard thing for our Reader to discerne, whether of vs dooth performe a true Reckoning.

* *Encom. p. 216*

22. Notwithstanding, I speake not this to iustifie all the examples which *Azorius* giueth; but I insist in his generall rule, which is, that the *Outward speech doe carry in it a double sense:* for we must measure the examples by the rule, and not the rule by examples, and so interpret *Azorius* his examples, that he thereby doe not contradict himselfe.

23. The fourth rule concludeth directly, that in the case, when no iniury is offered vnto vs, we may not use any speech, but in a sense which is vnderstood of the Hearer. This rule challengeth plaine dealing, without any Equiuocating at all. And now descend we vnto the last rule, which I said did hit the nail on the head, which M. Parsons laughed at; but it will in earnest hit him on the head, albeit hee doe vse all the wit in his head to auoyde it.

A charge against M. Parsons.

24. The first rule of *Azorius* (said I) is this: *If the wordes we use are not according to their common signification among men, ambiguous or doubtfull, and haue onely one sense, we ought to use them in that sense, which they haue in themselves: neyther is it lawfull for vs, although we be examined a-*

* *Preamb. p. 85*

1 *Quinta regula, &c.*

Azor. Jes. Inst.

part. I. l. II. c. 4.

in fine cap.

M. Parsons E-
quiucation
found to be
a lie.

"gainst right and iustice, to detort or turne our speech, by our in-
ward conceit of minde, because it is not lawfull for vs to lie: but
"he doth lie, who understandeth his speeches otherwise then they
"doe signifie in themselves. The difference betweene our Mi-
"tigator and this Jesuite is no more then this: first P. R. de-
"feadeth an Equiucation, which is, when the speech hath no
"double sence in the outward wordes themselves, but onely in
"some secret reseruatiō in the minde of the speaker. But Azo-
"rius saith, that we ought not to vse any sence of speech, which
"is not in the wordes themselves, but onely in the inward thought
"of him that speaketh. Secondly P. R. maintaineth, that his
"mentall Reseruatiō is a truth: but Azorius concludeth,
"that it is a lie. And can there be a greater contradiction be-
"tweene M. Parsons and Azorius then this? I pray thee,
good Reader, let vs heare M. Parsons his defence, and so shall
we easily discerne his spirit, and coniure it.

MR. PARSONS his Reckoning for his discharg.

Reckon. p. 272.
273.

YOU see that Azorius forbiddeth onely, that words, which haue
but one onely naturall sence and signification, and are not ambi-
guous, or of diuers senses, should be vsed by the speaker in any o-
ther signification, then naturall, or by common vse among men they
doe yeeld: As for example, if one that had an Horse, and not an Oxe,
should be demanded whether he had any Horse, hee should say, No,
meaning that he had no Oxe, for that hee conceiued an Oxe for an
Horse; this were not lawfull, saith Azor. in the vse of wordes, because
the word Horse hath but one proper meaning amongst men, and can-
not signifie an Oxe: and consequently cannot be so taken, but by a
lie. But if the word Horse had a doubtfull or double signification, sig-
nifying as wel an Oxe as an Horse, then might a man vse the amphi-
bologie of the word, to auoyd any iniury offered him by an incompetent
Iudge, as Azor. himselfe determineth. Who would thinke then that a
man of common sence, or of any mean modesty, and care of his credite
would haue alleadged Azor. so confidently against his Aduersary, as M.
Mortus doth? and that which is most ridiculous, so to insult against him,
as he doth against me here, saying, P. R. maintaineth that his mentall Re-
seruatiō is a truth, but Azorius concludeth that it is a lie. And can there be
any greater contradiction then this? &c.

Reckon. ibid.

The

The Renewwe.

25. Often haue I called the indifferent Reader to audit our Reckoning, but in this so strange a knacke of Sophistrie, I would make bolde to appeale vnto the Priests and Professors of Acquiocation, to iudge of Mr. Parsons his practise in this point. The wordes of *Azorius* are these: *When the wordes are not of any doubtfull signification, but haue but one onely sense, we must vse them in that sense, which they yeeld: (his reason) because he doth lie, who taketh them in another sense then they signifie: Which M. Parsons expoundeth by an example of one, that hath an Horse and not an Oxe, and being demanded whether he haue an Horse, he should say no, meaning, that he hath no Oxe.*

26. But *Azorius* doth not make any mention of an Horse or an Oxe, or of any such examples, which beeing vittered wholly with the mouth, doe make no true sense. For this outward speech vsed without mentall reseruatiō, viz. *I haue no Horse*, meaning, *I haue no Oxe*, is doubtles a lying mixture. But *Azorius* vseth onely such examples, which being deliuered outwardly with the mouth haue a true sense; and yet being vsed with a mixture of reseruatiō, are, in his iudgement, a lie. I must craue patience of thee (Christian Reader) to suffer me to enlarge my selfe in discussing the iudgement of *Azorius*, because M. Parsons his fraude will be more notoriously apparant, and his defence of *Mentall Equiuocation* receiue (as I may so say) a deadly wound.

27. *Azorius* beginneth his dispute thus: "Some (sayeth he) speaking of the same Romish Doctors) propounde this generall rule, and say, that it is no lie, although the wordes (which a man vseth in his promise by an oath) be not of an ambiguous and doubtfull signification, but that the speech is made true in our secret understanding. This is the state of the question, which *Azorius* intendeth to determine by his fīue rules aforesaid, namely concerning a Speech, which some Romish Doctors doe holde to be true in the secret understanding. But there was neuer man of any sober vnderstanding, who could fancy that

A wicked forgery vsed by M. Parsons, to shift himselfe from the note of a lie.

*m Azor. part. I.
Inst. Moral. l. 11.
c. 4. §. Quinto.*

M. Parsons vseth a strange and strong delusion to abuse his Reader.

to

to be true in the secret vnderstanding of man, which M. Parsons hath propounded, viz. *I haue no Horse, meaning no Oxe*, which is M. Parsons his proper deuise.

28. Secondly, the example which immediately followeth in that place of *Azorius*, and was vsed by the Patrons of Equiuocation, for the manifesting of their meaning, is this:

^a *Azor. ibid.* As for example (say they) if thou require any summe of money of me, and I hauing so much money shall answere [*I haue it not*] reseruing in my minde [*To lend it vnto thee,*] although they say (saith *Azorius*) that this outward speech hath no ambiguous sense, but that I therem doe absolutely signifie, that [*I haue it not*] yet I conceiue in my minde [*I haue it not to lend:*] Therefore say they, I doe say the truth, and doe not sinne by perjury. This is the immediate example, which is set downe to patterne the former question, concerning an *Ambiguous speech by mentall Reseruation*; which *Azorius* is about to decide, and to tell vs whether this kinde of Reseruation be a lie, or no. Can there be any affinity betweene this example, and M. Parsons his *Horse and Oxe*?

29. Thirdly (which amplifieth his conuiction more fully) Mr. Parsons doth iumpe both in doctrine and example with those Romish Patrons of mentall Reseruation, whom *Azorius* in this place doth professedly confute. Of Mr. Parsons his doctrine we haue often heard: Now let vs behold his example set downe in his *Mitigat. cap. 9. pag. 403. num. 80.*

M. Parsons example of mentall Equiuocation, proued a lie out of *Azorius*.

“where it pleased him iocantly to pose me thus: *I would aske*
 “*Tho. Morton this case, that if a man in England, whose fauor*
 “*he much desireth and esteemeth, and yet hee would be loath to*
 “*lend money, for that he knew him to spend much, and not to*
 “*hold payment of his debts to be necessary to saluation; If this*
 “*great man demand of him, whether he had five hundred pound*
 “*to lend him, and supposing that he had them, but loath to lend,*
 “*or loose them, what would he do or answere in this case, if there*
 “*were no other meanes, but eyther to confesse that he hath them,*
 “*and thereby loose them by lending, or denie that he hath them,*
 “*and thereby incurre a lie, and damne his soule? Hath the God*
 “*of nature left no lawfull manner of enation by reason and force of*
 wit

"wit in such an incumbrance? Hee that hath giuen unto the
 "Hare & Foxe sharpenes of sense, by leaps, turnings, & windings,
 "by going backe the same trace they came, to deceiue dogges?
 "I doubt not but that Tho. Morton would answere the Noble-
 "man, he had them not, though they lay in his Chist, understan-
 "ding by force of Equiuocation [That he had them not to lend,
 "Or, not so as he could spare] Or, some other like reseruation,
 "which we say that without a lie he might vse.

30. We see yet that *M. Parsons* doth conspire together
 with those other Aequiuocators, of whom *Azorius* spake
 both in the position and example. Now if *Azorius* call both
 their former conclusion, and this very same example a lie, then
 I thinke I may lawfully aske *M. Parsons*, what kinde of crea-
 ture he himselfe may be iudged to be, who doubting of *Azo-
 rius* his sincere iudgement, hath foisted in this aliant, and fond
 example of an *Horse* and an *Oxe*.

31. *Azorius* therefore, after hee had repeated those Do-
 ctors reasons, whereby they fought to confirme their owne
 position, he saith, *Meo tamen iudicio, &c.* But in my iudgement,
 they extend that Rule further then is meete, for there can be no-
 thing so false, which cannot be freed from all lying if we keepe any
 thing, as we list, concealed in our minde: for by this meanes
 whatsoener a man shall demand of vs, we may answere by deny-
 ing that we haue it, yea though we haue it, understanding in our
 minde [That we may giue it,] Whatsoener we shall do, Whatsoener
 we shall see, Whatsoener we shall thinke or purpose, we may by this
 meanes denie, that we haue eyther done, or seene, or thought, or
 purposed it; namely in this sense, [That I may tell you.] There-
 fore I thinke otherwise, which I will specify in certaine Rules.
 Thus farre *Azorius*.

32. By this it is manifest, that taking the same example of
 denying that I haue it, with reseruation, [To lend or so giue it,]
Azorius matcheth it with the vilest kind of lying, saying that,
 if this kind of speech be true, there is nothing so false, which may
 not be freed from a lie. And in the end, (concerning the same
 obiection) he answereth by the fift Rule, saying, (as wee haue
 heard) That if the wordes, which wee vse, be not ambiguous in

(e)

their

His abuse of
his Reader.

their owne signification, and common vse of men, wee must vse them in that sense which they yeeld; neither is it lawfull for vs, although we be asked against right and equity, to wrest any thing into a different sense, by the inward conceit of our minde, for it is not lawfull for vs to lie; but he lyeth, who taketh wordes otherwise then they signifie in themselves. Such as he iudgeth M. Parsons his speech concerning not lending of money, to be; M. Parsons calleth the Speech qualified by only mentall Reseruation a truth; Azorius contrarily calling this speech a flat lie. So that this being the true, reall, direct and professed resolution, determination, and conclusion of their Iesuite Azorius M. Parsons must needs be thought to haue wilfully iniured this Author, and also to haue abused his too credulous Reader, whom by this his owne fiction of an Horse and an Oxe, he purposed to make as wise as an Asse.

M. Parsons professeth to Equiuocate with his friends.

33. And now I cease to maruel why M. Parsons propounded for his Schoolemaster the nature of the Foxe, by using windings, turnings, & skipings forward and backward, seeing he hath shewed himselfe so excellent a proficient in that arte: onely this is to be wondered at, that seeing the Foxe doth vse this guyle onely in flying from Dogges, which are mortall enemies vnto him, M. Parsons professeth the practise of his craft in the case of lending money to his friends and favorites. Wee proceede to the next witnesse against Mentall Reseruation.

S E C T. IIII.

The next witnesse against Mentall Equiuocation, is the Iesuite Emanuel Sa; concerning whom it was my Charge against M. Parsons.

* Preamb. p. 86.

* Mod. Answ.
cap. 10.

34. MY Aduersary the Moderate Answerer (* said I) to qualifie the hatefulness of the Equiuocating Sect, did tell vs that ° A Iesuite famous amongst the Casuists, Emanuel Sa, in his Aphorismes, writeth of this matter in these words :

"wordes: *Quidam dicunt, &c.* Some there be who say, that
 "he who is not bound to answer vnto the intention of the exa-
 "miner, may answer by reservation of some thing in his minde,
 "to wit, [That it is not so, viz. that I must tell it vnto you] al-
 "though others doe not admit this manner of answering, and
 "peradventure vpon better reason then the former. Whereby it
 "is manifest (saith that Moderate Answerer) that all Catho-
 "likes doe not allow of Equiuocation. Thus farre that Answer-
 "er: confessing hereby that diuers Catholike Ansbours haue
 "contradicted this Equiuocating forgery, which P. R. hath
 "auouched no Catholike writer did ever contradict.

*The summe of Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning, charging
 his Aduersary with falshood: First concer-
 ning a word.*

Let the Reader stand attent, for that Mr. Morton may not escape, vntill he haue satisfied somewhat. * Mr. Morton hath here committed many falshoods both against Emanuel Sa, against the Moderate Answerer, and against my self against Eman. Sa: thus * Sa addeth vnto his sentence, *forte potius rationem admittam*, that is, Perhaps this latter opinion is the better. Which word (perhaps) Mr. Morton craftily left out.

Reck. c. 4. §. 13.
 pag. 276.

* Reck. pag. 279.

* Reck. p. 276.
 about the 10.
 line.

The Review.

35. I beseech thee (good Reader) stand attent, and doe M. Parsons right and iustice, and let not me escape vntill I haue satisfied. Thou hast heard, the first Accusation is of craft, for omitting the word, *perhaps*, in translating the sentence of the Iesuit Sa, viz. *forte potius ratione*; which M. Parsons hath (I must needs say) truely rendred into English thus, [Perhaps with better reason:] I likewise confesse, that in my translation of those wordes, I vsed not the word, *perhaps*, for I rendred them thus, [Peradventure with better reason:] which translation I expressly then set down both in my booke of Full Satisfact. Part. 1. cap. 27. pag. 86. and in my last Preamb. pag. 86. about the 14. lin. which M. Parsons also hath alleaged in his margent, where it is Englished thus, *Alsbough*

How desperat-
 ly M. Parsons
 can falsifie.

others doe not admit this manner of answering, and [*peradventure*] with better reason. Which *M. Parsons* himselfe was not ignorant of, for in the 275. page of this his Reckoning, about the 30. line, he acknowledgeth that I deliuered the wordes thus: *Others doe admit this reason, and that [peradventure] with better reason.* If it shall please any reader, who can but spell English, to examine these places, he shall finde them so as I haue now alleaged. How then can *M. Parsons* escape the accusation of a crafty and malicious accuser? will he say that in translation *perhaps*, and, *peradventure*, are different, and not sinonimically and significantly, the same? So may he deserue to be reckoned among the wise men of *Gotham*, who could not see wood for trees, or to shake the fellow by the hand, who said that *pepper is hot in operation, but cold in working.* I should call this manner of dealing of *M. Parsons monstrous*, but that it is ordinary, as we haue proued, and will now further manifest.

*M. PARSONS his Reckoning, and second
Charge against his Aduersarie.*

Reck. pag. 276.

**Reck. pag. 277.*

THAT which *Emanuel Sa* spake of a particular case before a Iudge incompetent, he taketh vniuersally against all *Equiuocation*, without exception. * Which *Mr. Morton* could not choose but know to be a fraude, for that in the next lines *Eman. Sa* doth resolue two other cases, wherein a man may *Equiuocate*.

The Reniew.

*† Mitigat. cap. 8.
pag. 321. and as
I repeated it.
Preamb. pag. 43.
M. Parsons wit-
tifie falsity.*

*† Reck pag. 278.
num. 79.*

36. Here he saith that I haue taken *Sa* as speaking vniuersally against all *Equiuocation*, and yet knew that our whole dispute is by vs both restrained *¶ only vnto mentall Equiuocation*: which is euident by the very place, (*Preamb. pag. 86*) mentioning expressly *Mentall Equiuocation*. Therefore this accusation of excepting against all *Equiuocation*, is a witting (except he had not haue me rather call it a witleffe) falsity. Secondly, I deliuered that sentence of *Sa* out of the testimony of my Aduersary the *Moderate Answerer*, as *M. Parsons* himselfe knoweth and I confesse: if therefore there were

were an error, why doth *M. Parsons* let his owne companion escape, and runne vpon me for his debt, who neuer vnder-tooke to be surety for so loose a fellow as that man is, to promise for him that he would not deale falsely? His reason is, because *I could not* (saith he) *but know this to be a fraude*. If it were a fraude, more shame for the *Moderator*: but if it be no fraude, what shame will it be for our *sober Reckoner*: who euen in saying that *I could not but haue read S^a*, bewrayeth his lauish presumption, because probably I might haue rested vpon so plaine and sufficient a testimony of that my Aduersary.

His singular
fraude.

27. Notwithstanding, I may not deny but that I did reade *S^a* in the place cited *Ti. de mendacio*, where the case is thus put: *If a man demaund the whole debt, whereas thou owest him only a part, thou maist deny that thou owest him, viz. so much as he demaundeth*. Weigh the sense of the wordes themselves; and the ambiguity, and we shall easily discern that which they call Equiuocation, is not only in the secret reservation of the minde, but sufficiently implied in the outward speech it selfe, so that the hearer may collect out of the wordes the secret sense, and so it is a verball Equiuocation, and not *Mentall*. Nay, when one asketh the *whole debt*, and I denie that I owe it him, who is there almost but will vnderstand that in that speech is signified, that I owe not that whole debt which is demaunded? Neither doth the iudgment of *S^a* in other cases differ from the former opinion of *Azorius*, by whom the *Mentall Equiuocation*, as it is described by *M. Parsons* hath beene condemned for a *lie*: Only *S^a* deliuereth his iudgement with a *forte*, or, *per aduenture*, (I cry you mercy *M. Parsons*, I should haue said, *perhaps*) and *Azorius* doth resolutely shew that your doctrine of Equiuocation is concluded in a lying case. But I demaund whether *M. Parsons* will stand to the iudgment of their Iesuit *S^a*, or no?

M^r. PARSONS his Reckoning.

I Ndeede in the last edition of his booke at *Cambrige*, An. 1607. his whole last sentence was left out, as though he had changed his opinion.

Reck. pag. 270.

(c 3)

The

The Review.

A due suspicio
of craft among
the Romanists
in altering and
corrupting the
opinions of
their owne
Iesuits.

* See above
Cap. 1. §. 2. & 6.

* See hereafter
Cap. 14. §. 1.

38. Or rather that your booke-gelders haue changed his writings, according vnto your new professed occupation, in corrupting of your owne Authours, whensoever they chance to say any thing which foundeth preiudiciall to your cause: which caused your owne Doctour to complaine; and that not without some indignation, that none can be suffered to write freely among you, but forthwith, as it happened * (saith he) vnto Card. Bellarmine himselfe, he is compelled to recant it; or else such thinges are blotted out of their bookes, &c. Which bookeish massacre being so generally practized, God knoweth how fatall it may proue. The like to that of *Sa* will probably befall one day vnto your Iesuit *Azorius*, who holdeth the same with *Sa*, yet (without all perhaps) determinately: and so the bookes being changed, it must happen in proceffe of time, that these allegations, which we now vse out of him, will be noted for lying slanders, euen as I haue beene already noted withall by *M. Parsons*, about the testimony of * *Polydore*, when he charged me with falshood in citing him out of his old Editions: which they themselues haue professedly and publickely altered, and indeede corrupted. Can such dealing stand with tearmes of common honesty? But *M. Parsons* will lay some accusations against me, for he hath vowed that *I may not escape*.

MR. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reck. pag. 278.
& 279.

HE citeth the foresaid authority of *Eman. Sa*, alleaged out of his *Moderate Answerer* for a shadow, dissembling that he had looked vpon the Authour: but could not doe this tranfomely enough, for he doth egregiously abuse his foresaid aduersary, by making him seeme to deduce out of that particular case an absolute deniall of all Equiuocation, making him to conclude thus, that all Catholikes doe not allow of Equiuocation. But *Mr. Morton* let me pose you here: Is it true that your Aduersary said so farre, and no further to the purpose in hand? Or is it not rather true that you cut him off, and would not suffer him to say any further? for your Aduersary did fully cleare the matter, if you would haue suffered him to tell on his tale, for these are his wordes: [Whereby it is manifest that all Catholikes doe not allow of Equiuocation,

equivocation, where he is not bound to answer the Iudge or Examiner proceeding unjustly, and not according to law and equity.] Whereby is evident that he alleaged not *Sa*, as denying all Equivocation, but in particular cases, where he that is demanded is not bound to make answer.

The Reuerſe.

39. The Moderate Answerer saith that *Sa* allowed not Equivocation, &c. and I reported no more: for if my Reader can finde that I added *All Equivocation*, then wil I be contented with the adiunct of a detestable lyer. What else? *I cut off*, His rude cauil.
 forsooth the Answerers tale, not telling that he meant of such cases, wherein a man is bound to answer, *Grave crimen*: this his meaning was sufficiently expressed in the very question it selfe, as I alleaged it, standing thus: *Some there be that say* Preamb. p. 86.
that he who is not bound to answer, &c. Here the case was manifested to hold onely, *Where the partie is not bound to answer*, in which cases M. Parsons doth iustifie *Mentall Reseruation*: but *Eman. Sa* telleth vs, that some Romish Doctors doe not admit this doctrine, and perhaps (saith he) *with better reason*. We shall neede no more, for now I haue our Raynard in the straits; what are the cases (M^{ast}. Parsons, for I meane to pose you) wherein you would haue your *Eman. Sa* seeme to admit of a mentall Reseruation? Eyther must they be when the partie is bound to answer vnto a competent and lawfull Iudge, which kinde of mentall Reseruation, you haue held to be vnlawfull, and a lie: Or else it must be vnderstood in case that the partie is not bound to answer vnto the Iudge, because the Iudge is incompetent; and in this case *Eman. Sa* (as you know) doth not allow of your *Mentall Reseruation*. Therefore as I did not conceale the case you speake of, so haue you no cause to haue it revealed, because it maketh fully against you, who defend a Reseruation, when a man is not bound to answer, as before an incompetent Iudge. Now therefore, after you haue gained attention of your Reader, consider what arrerages come vpon you by this Reckoning: first your falsehood, in taxing the omission of the word *perhaps*: Secondly in objecting the word *All*; thirdly, imputing a concealment of the

Dilemma.

the *Case*: and lastly, the losse of your cause, by the iudgement of *St.*, and together with him by the iudgement of *Some other Romish Writers.*

SECT. V.

The next witsesse against M. Parsons his described mentall Equivocation, is the Iesuite Maldonate.

The Charge against M. Parsons.

* Preamb. p. 87.
† Maldon. Ies.
Commen. in Luc.
vlt. vers. 28.

39. *Maldonate* (said I) a principall Iesuite and Casuist
“ *resolueth thus: ‘Whosoever dooth endeavour by fey-
ning to deceive another, although he intend to signifie something
else, yet doubtlesse he lyeth. Mr. Parsons How will satisfie for
this?’* ”

*Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning against
his Adversary.*

*Reckon. cap. 4.
§. 14 pag. 283.*

HE stileth *Maldonate* a *Casuist*, who is neuer knowne to haue read
or written of *Cases* in his life, but Scholasticall Diuinity hee
professed many yeares in *Paris*, and left very learned *Commen-
taries* vpon all the foure *Euangelists*, though the *Roman Index Expurg.
Anno 1607.* doe mention, that certaine *cases* of conscience published by
another, and Printed at *Lyons*, Anno 1604. were falsly ascribed to him.

The Reueiwe.

*M. Parsons
dissolute and
vill rathnesse
and ignorance*

40. Rather will *M. Parsons* play small play then sit out: and
now the *Gambster* thinketh that he hath taken a blot; for
Maldonate, forsooth was no *Casuist*. If this be an error, then
marke (good Reader) what guides haue mis-led me: First (a
Casuist being one who discusseth *cases* of conscience) the ve-
ry Title of the booke Anno 1605, in the name of *Maldonate*
is this: *A briefe Summe, concerning most difficult Questions of
Cases of conscience, necessarie for euery Priest, when he heareth
confessions.* Which booke was set forth *Permissu Superiorum*,
that

that is, *By permission of the Superiours*. Secondly, in the Epistle Dedicatory the same *Maldonate* is, by name, commended by the Collector of these cases (a Friar) in these wordes: *When I sought for a man, who had explicated the difficulty of some cases of conscience, I could finde none among the most learned, who had performed this better then Maldonate: which argueth that he was to bee esteemed a most singular Casuist.* Lastly, your owne Iesuite *Ribadineira* in his Catalogue of Iesuiticall-Authors, *An. 1608.* expressly recounteth among the workes of *Maldonate*, the foresaid *Summa Casuum Conscientia*. ¶ Tit. Iob. Maldonatus.

41. Will Mr. Parsons charity giue him leaue to say that your Friar *Martin*, and the other *Superiours* who suffred it to passe, and your Iesuite *Ribadineira* also were heerein *Grosse deceivers*? Then indeede must I confesse, that I haue beene grossely deceiued. But seeing that he knew that *Maldonate* was thus esteemed of by these Romanists, his charity towards his owne friends might haue a little asswaged his malice against me, whilst that he chargeth me by the *Grossenesse* of other mens deserts. And we may furthermore obserue what little credite is to be giuen vnto their Romish bookes, which come vnder the name of their Writers, seeing that the books of Iesuites are falsly inscribed. Let vs leaue titles, and examine the truth of the matter it selfe.

Obserue the little credite which may be giuen vnto new Romish bookes.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Doth *Maldonate* say any thing in this sentence, that is not conforme to our common doctrine of *Equiuocation*? No truly: for we graunt that whosoever doth indeauor by feyning to deceiue another, doth lie. Insomuch that it agreeth well with the definition of a lie, set downe in *St. Aug. Mendacium est falsa vocis significatio cum intentione fallendi*: A lie is a false signification of speech, with intention to deceiue: which two clauses of the definition of a lie, I doe proue and demonstrate for diuers leaues together in the 8. Chapter of my former Treatise, that they cannot agree with the nature of *Equiuocation*, and by consequence that *Equiuocation* is no lie. Not the first clause, a false signification of speech, which is when the speech doth differ from the meaning and sense.

Reckon. pag. 283.
284.
Lib. de mend. c. 4.
& lib. con. mend.
ca. 12.

(f)

The

The Renewe.

42. Least that *Maldonate* might seeme to make against you, you answere not directly to these wordes, *Although he intend not to signifie aliquid praterea*, that is, *Something else*, which indefinitely signifieth something *Else*, whatsoeuer it be. Now apply your last example vnto this Rule. *If your friend demaund of you to lend him some money*, which you know that you haue in your Chest, yet you are provided to answere, *I haue it not*, meaning, *to lend it*: This your *Azorius* called a plaine lye, and this is it which *Maldonate* doth intend, who in this exception against any Reservation, which is onely mental, doth imply all, saying, [*Although he saie to himselfe something else.*] Let vs see whether your second deuise will stand you in any steade.

Mr. PARSON'S his Reckoning.

Reck. pag. 284.

NOr the second of intention to deceiue: for that the first and principall intention of him that is forced for some iust cause to Equiuocate (for otherwise he may not vse it,) is to deliuer himselfe from that iniury which is offered him, and not to deceiue the Iudge or hearer, though consequently that doe follow. And this I proue to be so cleare, as that by this are iustified all Stratagems in warre, which are indeede nothing but *Equiuocations* in fact, that otherwise should be vnlawfull and sinfull.

The Renewe.

43. What haue we to doe with *Stratagems of warre*? for onely actions (which is when there is no word or promise going before, which may be contradicted by their own actions) in themselves, doe neyther affirme nor denie: We speake of the *speech of man*, which doth eyther affirme something, or denie something: and a lie, or truth (we know) doth properly consist in affirmation or *negation*. Drawe nearer to the Question.

Stratagems
not properly
lies.

M. PARSON'S his Reckoning.

Reck. pag. 285.

NOr the second clause (*of intention to deceiue*) conteyned in *S. Augustines* definition of a lie, doth in no case truly enter into Equiuocation. For that he which vseth lawfull Equiuocation, hath nor his first
and

and principall end to deceiue the hearer, but to auoyde the hurt, which he is subiect vnto, if he did not Equiuocate; albeit thereby it followeth that the other be deceiued, which is without all fault of him which speaketh doubtfully. Which I doe demonstrate by many examples out of the Scriptures and Fathers; whereby it is euident that this permission of others to be deceiued by our speech, when we doe in effect but *conceale a truth*, is lawfull, and vsed by Saints, yea God himselte, and consequently can be no lie.

The Review.

44. You shall neuer be able to prooue your *Mentall Equiuocation*, which you haue described, from Scriptures or Fathers. And here you haue no way to auoyde the second part of S. *Augustines* definition, which is, an *Intention to deceiue another*, but by distinguishing of the *intention*, as principall, and lesse principall; because his *principall end* is to *auoyde hurt*, his lesse principall is to deceiue: yet we see that when man doth intend to Equiuocate, that he may *auoyd lying*, he doth, for auoyding hurt, intend to deceiue. And if this were a good answer, what sinne is there almost, which M. *Parsons* might not iustifie by this distinction? The thiefe, whilest hee robbeth a man of his money, doth not principally intend to robbe, because his principall end is to enrich himselte: For if hee were not moued by the desire and hope of gaine, hee would neuer commit robbery. So likewise he that deceiueh any by lying: As for example, the damnable couple in the *Acts*, who lyed in denying the iust price of their sale of the land before S. *Peter*. If any should doubt, whether in that speech to lie or to gaine something to themselues were their more principall end; it may be easily discerned by this, because they did not seeke aduantage that they might lie, but they did lie for their aduantage: What can M. *Parsons* say now? (for I must pose him) Will he answere that by such lying a man doth not lie, because his principall end is *not to lie*? Then will it follow that a man lieth not, when he lieth. Or did he lie notwithstanding that his lesse principall end was to lie, or deceiue? Then doth not his distinction helpe you, for freeing his mentall Equiuocation from a lie. As yet *Maldonate* is against him, and

M. Parsons
frivolous distinction.

u A. 8. 5.

this *M. Parsons* saw in his *Mitigation*, otherwife why did he skippe ouer this place, where it was particularly obiected againſt him.

*Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning, in charging
his Aduerſary.*

*Reckon. pag.
285, 286.*

HOW did I willingly pretermitt to anſwere him, when as he ſaid nothing againſt me, but with me, and for me, as I doe ſhew by diuers diſtinct numbers, citing him alſo num. 75. pag. 399. and this very place here quoted by *Mr. Morton*, together with another of *Toletus* to the ſame effect? What meaneth, I ſay, *Mr. Morton* to deale ſo vnſincerely in ſuch fort as euery child may ſee his fraude? And if any man will doubt, whether *Maldonate* did defend Equiuocation in ſuch caſes as we doe, wherein ſomewhat is referred in the minde of the ſpeaker, more then is ſpecified in the wordes, let him reade him in his Commentaries vpon the Gospels, in the places that containe ſuch referuations.

The Renewe.


45. I haue dealt moſt ſincerely: for that, which I charged you with, was only the aboue cited teſtimony of *Maldonate*, which you (as I ſaid, and you cannot deny) did pretermitt, as a timorous weakling doth willingly paſſe by his ouer-match: yet now to ſcrape ſome acquaintance with him, leauing his poſitiue rule, you are gladd to ſeeke into his Explications of Scriptures, wherein you may ſee for your purpoſe; what? euen the man in the moone. But of this hereafter.

CHAP. XIII.

Containing those objected vntruthes, whereof I cleared
my selfe in the Preamble; which M. Parsons doth ex-
amine againe, and call into his new Reckoning. First,
in the testimony of Polydore.

S E C T. I.

My former discharge.

1.  Made bould to cite *Polydore*, to shew that
Popes of later times had their names chan-
ged by *Antiphrasis*, that is, a contrariety,
“ as being *unciuil* to be called *Vrbanus*, &c.
Vpon this *M. Parsons* grew very violent,
“ saying, *The Minister hath neither simplicity nor truth, but a* ^{a Mitigat. Epist.}
“ *lost conscience, by calumniationes fraught with deceitfulnesse* ^{dedic. n. 18. 19.}
“ *and malice, laying this obseruation vpon Polydore, and ci-*
“ *ting no place.*

The Charge against M. Parsons.

2. Since that I^b haue both cited the direct wordes, and al-
leaged the place, which his fellowes haue put out of their
new Editions, and yet since h^rth *M. Parsons* deceitfully char-
ged me with not citing of that, which, least it should be ci-
ted, they themselues haue blotted out of the booke: and now
he reckoneth both for the Authour, and for the testimony
it selfe.

^b Preamb. p. 90.
Excellent fraud
in abuse of
their owne
Authors. See
a little after.
num. 5.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

I had not that part of *Polydore*, *De inuentoribus Rerum*, by me.

Recken. cap. 5.
§. 1. pag. 295.

The Reuiewe.

3. Had you not *Polydore* by you, *M. Parsons*? wee shall
try this by your answere in your *Mitigation*. ^c *Let the indi-*
“ *cious Reader indge (say you) whether the Authour thereof be* ^{c Mitigat. Epist.}
“ *(f 3.)* ^{Dedicat. num.}
“ *a Mi-* ^{18. & 19.}

"a Minister of simple truth; Polydore saith only that some-
 "time Popes, as other Princes, haue had names, which haue
 "beene different and contrary to their nature. Is this the tenure
 of an answerer, who saw not Polydore; to say that Polydore
 saith only, &c. But it may be *M. Parsons*, although he can-
 not free himselfe from fraude, will escape the guilt of a lye by
 Equiuocation, saying that he saw not Polydore, meaning,
 with his beeles: otherwise to charge me with so infamous a
 fallhood, in alleaging Polydore, when as yet he himselfe had
 not Polydore by him; doth in effect tell vs that *M. Parsons*,
 in answering, is sometime by himselfe. What further concer-
 ning the booke.

MR. PARSONS Reckoning.

Reck. pag. 196.
 197.

Albeit the wordes, which he saith he hath cited out of Polydor. de
Inuent. lib. 4. cap. 10. be not in any of our bookes now common-
 ly extant, yet he saith that they are in the Edition of Basil An.
 1570. and that two yeares after by Pope Pius Quintus the *Index Expur-*
gatorius did put out these wordes: but he telleth not what *Index* it was,
 for I haue one containing both the Flemmish and Spanish *Index*,
 Printed at Basil An. 1544. wherein this obseruation is not found, which
M. Morton saith was Printed Anno 1570. which was 26. yeares after.
 Whereof must needes be inferred, that either *M. Morton* dealeth not
 sincerely with vs in this matter (which yet I will not be so vnfriendly as
 to suspect) or that his Edition of 1570. (which hitherto I cannot see)
 hath receiued this addition about the Popes changing of their names
 after the foresaid Edition of 1544.

The Reuerſe.

4. Can *M. Parsons* possibly not suppose me to be insincere
 in this point, who hath challenged me for so egregious a falsi-
 ficator in so many passages? either is he more credulous then
 he ought to be, or else am I more credible then he hath decy-
 phered me to be. Howsoever, I haue little reason to credit a-
 ny of his Reckonings: and euen in this very place he is in-
 tollerable, for the bookes of Polydore which haue not that
 sentence in them haue (as he knoweth) beene much purged;
 as their owne booke, which is intituled, *Index librorum pro-*
hibitorum, that is, *The Catalogne of bookes which haue beene*
prohibited,

prohibited, doth expressly shew, telling vs that, ^d *The booke of Polydore, De Inuentoribus Rerum, is permitted, which was purged by the command of Pope Greg. 13. in the yeare 1576.* ^d *Index libror. prohibet. Tit. Polydor. Virg.* How could he then but suspect, that such a sentence as this was blotted out?

5. Again, I cited in the margent the *Index Belgicus*, which was printed *Lugduni An. 1586. (pag. 195.)* wherein these wordes, *Extra iocum, &c. and nine lines following* are commaunded to be blotted out. Which every one that will may finde in the auncient bookes of *Polydore*, and yet (as *M. Parsons* confesseth) is not in your new Editions: which sheweth that their new deuise of purging of bookes hath licensed them to belye the old.

M. PARSONS charging his Adversary.

BUt let vs heare the wordes themselves, which *M. Morton* setteth downe as found in his *Tolydore: Primus homos, &c.* This is the first honour giuen to the Bishop of Rome after his creation (saith he) that if his name be not faire, he may change the same: as for example (which yet be not spoken but in iest) if before perhaps he had beene an euill doer, he may be called *Bonifacius*, that is a good doer; if he had beene fearefull, then may he be called *Leo*, a Lyon; if rusticall, then *Urbanus*, or ciuill, &c. and the first Authour or beginner of this custome is said to haue beene Pope *Sergius 2.* whose name hauing beene before *Os porci*, which signifieth the mouth of an hogge, it was permitted vnto him (saith the supposed *Polydore*) for the auoiding the obscenitie of his former name, to change the same. These two thinges, that the first occasion of changing names should haue beene from Pope *Sergius 2.* hath no substance at all, *Platina* deliuereth it vpon report, *Onuphrius* confuteth it. Besides it is to be noted that *Os porci* is a surname of a family, which no Pope is wont to change, but only his Christian or proper name, as of late when *Hypolitus Aldobrandinus* was called *Clemens 8.* hee changed not the name of *Aldobrandinus*, but of *Hypolitus*.

Reck. pag. 297.

The Renicue.

6. Well, I am content to leaue your Authors in their conflict. Can you shew vs a reason, why he that will change his Christian name, will not also change his naturall name or surname? *Saul* Iewish was changed into *Paul* Christian; *Peter* ^{Popes change their Christen names,} ^{neuer}

neuer left his name which *Christ* gaue him. Now for the Pope to reiect his name which he receiued in Baptisme as a token of his Christendome, this seemeth to be a prophane mistery.

MR. PARSONS *his Reckoning.*

Reck. pag. 300.
Ch. 302.

Polydore saith only (and in a iest) that some might be named by changing their names: *Non extra iocum dictum sit*, that is, let it not be spoken without a iest. And Polydore saith only, *Liceat mutare*, they may change their names, but saith not that it was practized by any.

The Review.

Iesting:

7. For Hyistorians to report things in such manner, doth not imply that the matter was fabulous: *Ridendo dicere verum, quis vetat?* a man may laugh and tell a truth, as I might doe, in telling *M. Parsons* that I cannot without a iest obserue the differences of translations, which he hath inuented in [*Let not*] and [*May not,*] as though there had beene craft herein. For I beseech you, Sir, when the Apostle, speaking against vnlawfull separation of the wife from her husband, saith, * *Let not the wife depart from her husband*; if he had deliuered it thus: *A wife may not depart from her husband*, had these two differed any thing in sense? But why doe I hinder *M. Parsons* his sport, whose disposition is euen to play with a feather?

* 1. Cor. 7. v. 10.

S E C T. II.

His second charge against his Aduersary, about the Pope that was choaked with a flye.

* Preamb. p. 91.

8. **T**He mistaking of the name of the Emperour *Henry* 2. in stead of *Fredericke* 1. who was excommunicated by Pope *Adrian*; which *M. Parsons* will haue to proceede from maliciousnesse.

My

My discharge.

9. The only question was whether Pope *Adrian*, who excommunicated the Emperour, *was choaked with a fyfe*, or no, this was the maine; but whether he excommunicated *H. or F.* is but on the by, in respect of the scope of our dispute. Cardinall *f Bellarmine* erred often, in citing of Authours, and hath lately corrected those escapes, as alleaging *Ambrose*, in stead of *Augustine*; *Cyprian* in stead of *Cyrl*; *Innocentius* in stead of *Clemens*; and in such like errors their *Gratian* doth superabound: And yet may we not iudge so vncharitably, as to impute these faults vnto perfidioufnesse.

*f Bellar. in his
Correctorio.
pag. 170. &
pag. 192.*

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

IF *Mr. Morton* had not sleepe, nor read *Nauclerus* (as he saith) how did he presume to set downe his Latin wordes so precisely, as his Reader could haue no probable cause to doubt, but that they were his owne proper wordes? Was not this crafty perfidious dealing? This answer of *Mr. Morton* doth more intangle him in fallshood.

*Reck. cap. 5. §. 2
pag. 308.*

The Reniew.

10. Did euer sober man make such a question? how can one set downe precisely the wordes of an Authour, which he himselfe hath not read? Any child can answer, that this may easily be done, by reciting the sentence out of a writer, who hath collected it out of the Authour himselfe, which is vsuall in all that write. If I should aske *M. Parsons* this, did you neuer deliuer any testimony from an other mans writing, which was true? he would say that this is but a fond question, and yet it is Cosen germane to his owne, nor is it much vnlike vnto his next taxation for setting downe, out of *Nauclerus*, Many Italian writers, in stead of, so many Italian writers as he could see; as though all the writers which *Nauclerus* could see; were more then many.

Fond cauillations.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

So to conclude this Accompt, &c.

(g)

The

*The Revuew, shewing how M. Parsons hath slipped
ouer a peece of a former Charge, wherein he
was accused of an euident falshood.*

11. I doe not maruaile why *M. Parsons* maketh so great
hast to conclude, before he haue satisfied the Reckoning, lea-
uing a peece of debt on the score seeing that he had iust no-
thing to pay. For as he cannot but remember that he said that
^{g Mitigat. cap. 2.} " *g Nanclerus* reiecteth this story as false, and confute^h it by all
^{pag. 79.} " *Writers*, especially of *Italy*: so may he not forget what ^h I
^{h Preamb. p. 93.} answered him from *Nanclerus* his owne wordes, viz. that
 in fine. " he doth not reiect it as false, but was brought by differēces
 " of story of *Adrians* flye, to doubt whether side rather to
 " choose or beleene. Thus was *M. Parsons* his censure of *Nan-*
 His fraudulent
 concealment
 of his falshood *clerus* his iudgment, confuted out of the wordes of *Nan-*
clerus himselve. This his fraude he passed ouer without mention:
 belike he either esteemeth of so petty a fraude, as of a flye,
 and therefore neglected it; or else he feared that if he should
 mention it, it would proue like *Pope Adrians* flye, to choake
 him, because he was not able to swallow it downe.

SECT. III.

The disastrous endes of some Popes.

^{i Preamb. p. 94.} 12. **E**Xamples herof I related out of *Vrspergensis*: among
 others, the example of *Pope Anastasius*, reported by
 " your owne Doctors (said I) to haue beene stricke with the hand
 " of God, and so to haue perished. Citing for witnesses *Platina*,
 " *Supplementum Chron. Liber Pontificalis*, and *Turrecremata*.
M. Parsons redily swalloweth all the first three Cammels, and
 straineth a Gnat, to wit, the testimony of the last Authour
Turrecremata.

*M. PARSONS his Reckoning, and Charge
against his Adversarie.*

^{Reck. pag. 313.} I T followeth in your Narration out of some of our Doctors as you
 say; Bene legitur *Anastasium* Diuino nutu percussum interisse. It is read
 that

that *Anastafius* the Pope was strooken with the hand of God and perished : you cite for it *Ioh. de Turrecrem. lib. de summa Eccles. de Anastasio*. Which citation is so set downe, as I perswade my selfe that in his next reply he will haue this euasion, to say that he saw not the worke himselfe : for there are foure bookes of *Turrecrem. de summa Ecclesie*, and one onely hath more then an hundred Chapters, yet doth *Mr. Morton* neither specifie Booke nor Chapter ; which alwaies, you must imagine hath some mysteric. *Turrecremata lib. 2. Summe Eccles. cap. 103.* spake only by way of answering certaine obiections of them that brought in the example of *Anastafius*, &c.

The Reueiwe.

13. My Reader will be so indifferent as to obserue the place and wordes of *Turrecremata lib. 2. Eccles. cap. 103. Item nec facit ad propositum*, &c. Neither (saith he) doth it make any thing for the purpose, which some aduersaries say of *Anastafius* (out of the *Cap. Anastafius, Dist. 19. & in Glossa*) because although we reade there that some honest men departed from *Anastafius*, for that he had communicated with *Photius* and *Acatius*, yet doe we not reade that he was condemned by the whole Church ; but, *Benè legitur quòd fuerit diuino iudicio percussus, & ità à Deo depositus, that is : It is well said that he was strucke with Gods iudgment, and so deposed by God*; meaning, by a sodaine death, accordingly as it is in the *Glosse*, whereunto he hath relation. Which is not spoken by *Turrecremata* as we see, only by way of answering an obiection as *M. Parsons* pretendeth, but very asseuerantly : And therefore our Reader may discern in *M. Parsons* a mysterie, and the iniquity and falshood thereof. So little caule had I to concale the right Chapter, which *M. Parsons* (least the truth might be acknowledged) did, as it may seeme, wittingly ouer-passe, only that he might guilfully latch me within the suspicion of fraude and deceit.

M. Parsons his
admirable
craft and
falshood.

MR. PARSONS his Reckoning.

I Must aduertise the Reader, that the whole current of other Writers doe deny this matter about the inclination of Pope *Anastafius* to recall *Acatius*, affirming that the said *Acatius* was dead diuers yeares before *Anastafius* was Pope, as doe testifie *Niceph. Calixtus, Euagrius, Ana-*

Reck. pag. 314.

Gasius Bibliothecarius is Liberatus, Gelasius, and others: all which, or most are named in the first part of the Decree of Gratian, which is cyted also by M. Morton, and so if he looked vpon it, he abuseth vs greatly in dissembling the matter: and if he did not, why doth he cyte it?

The Review.

M. Parsons la-
with vntruth.

14. And I doe earnestly entreate our Reader to marke M. Parsons Aduertisement, and he will perhaps wonder at his importunate desire, to haue the witness of Gratian produced; for thus we read in Gratian, Dist. 19. Cap. Anastasius: *Anastasius the second, a Roman by birth, liued (saith he) in the dayes of K. Theodoricus, at what time many of the Clergie separated themselues from his Communion, because he without a Councell of Bishops and Priests, and Clergie of the Catholicke Church did communicate with Photius, who had communicated with Acatius; and because he meant secretly to call backe Acatius, he was stricken with the hand of God. That is (saith the Glosse) whilst he rid on an Asse, his bowels burst out, and hee ignominiously fell downe. Had you any reason to aske why I pretermitted these testimonies? And yet furthermore where it is objected, that Acatius was dead before Anastasius was Pope, this is answered in the Glosse vpon the Chap. going before, beginning thus: Secundum, &c. He (namely Anastasius) would call againe Acatius after he was dead, that prayers might be made for him in the Church. By this time you see the vnluckinesse of your importunity, requiring an Answer to that which was answered by your owne Glosse about the same place of Gratian. VVhich if you saw, then haue you (to vse your owne wordes) abused your Reader greatly in dissembling the matter. If you saw it not, then why did you cite the booke which preuenteth your Answer, and causeth you to repent of your rash imputation of dissemblance?*

*Preamb p. 94

15. Againe, Other examples of like nature were ^kcyted, "as that of Pope Iohn 10. who, by the practise of an infamous
"and lewd woman, was thrust into Peters chaire, and afterward
"by the vnchaste daughter Theodora choaked with a Pillow:
"and of Iohn 12. who when hee was in dalliance with another
mans

"mans Wife, was stricken in the temples of his head by a Dinell:
 "and of Pope Urbane, by a nick-name called Turban, who
 "(saith Urspergensis) rebelled against the Emperour, troubled
 "the Church, and was stricke by the hand of God. These cyta-
 tions haue beene right, and your answer is by opposing other
 Historians, who commended these Popes liues, vnto Histo-
 rians, who condemned them; and all is to teach your Reader
 to dance in a round.

S E C T. III.

*The third Obiection, concerning the testi-
 mony of Boucher.*

16. **C**ONCERNING ¹*Boucher* a Romish Doctor, who held it
 "lawfull for a priuate man to kill a Tyrant in the case
 "of publique enmity, cyther against the Church, or the Com-
 mon-wealth, which I iudged to bee a rebellious position, I
 must now answer according to my charge. ¹*Preamb. p. 95.*

*Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning, and charge
 against his Aduersary.*

BVE it is graunted by Doctor *Boucher* (sayth *M. Morton*) that *when the*
Common-wealth hath condemned and declared any Tyrant for a publicke
enemy, he may be slaine by a priuate man. Whereunto I answere, that
 then he is no priuate man, for that he doth it by a publicke authority
 of the Common-wealth, as doth the executioner that cutteth off a No-
 ble-mans head, by order and authority of the publicke Magistrate: so as
 in this *M. Mortons* distinction serueth him to no purpose, for that ney-
 ther for priuate, or publicke iniuries can a priuate man, as a priuate
 man, that is to say, by priuate authority kill any Prince, though he were
 a Tyrant, for any cause eyther priuate or publicke whatsoeuer So as
 in this principall charge *M. Morton* remaineth wholly conuicted, as you
 see. *Reckm. cap. 5. § 3. pag. 321. 322.*

The Reueiwe.

17. *Boucher* calleth him a priuate man: Take the case as
 (§ 3) Mr..

M. *Parsons* hath propounded it, that a *private man*, after the publique sentence of the Common-wealth, is no *private man*, but a publique and iust executioner: by the same rule he must imply, that when the Pope (whom they make Supreme in such cases) hath excommunicated a King, and commaunded Armes against him, then euery man may vse *Marshal-law*, and iustly murther that King. What is this but to put into the handes of men dagges, and knyues, and poisons for execution of their hatefull desires? But we returne vnto Doctor *Bouchier*. ^m *The case may be so vrgent* (saith he) *that the publicke iudgement neede not be expected, because where the crime is notorious, it is sufficiently condemned without further iudgement.* And he bringeth in the place of *Deut. 13. Thou shalt presently slay them, euen before the publicke iudgement of the Church published.* By this I conuince M. *Parsons* of notorious falshood, who defended that *Boucher* did not allow the killing of any King, but after the publique iudgement of the Common-wealth. Here we see a case, wherein *Iacke Straw* and *Wat Tyler*, and euery Rascall is armed for this purpose; euen before *publicke iudgement*. The answer which M. *Parsons* will giue vs in this his *Sober Reckoning*, is worth our attention.

^m Lib. 3. de abdicat. Hen. 3. c. 16 pag. 267.

M. *Parsons* notorious falshood.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reck. pag 322.

Doctor *Bouchier* in his fourth booke hath a whole Chapter to proue that in some vrgent cause the matter may be preuented, as when the thing is so notorious, instant and perilous, as the said publique iudgement cannot be expected: then for subiects to vse *pena priuata*, to withdraw their obedience, and only to defend themselves; and not *positiua*, that is, the positive punishment of actuall Rebellion, or warre offensive: So as considering what here is in the Question, hee (that is, T. M.) must needes be condemned of a *quibilibet*, or a *saluum dicit*.

The Renewe.

ⁿ Bouchier de iusta abdic. l. 4. c. 2.

^o Ibid. c. 3. p. 354

18. *Incunde dictum, & ioculariter* M. *Parsons* is a iolly but yet a iugling fellow: for although D.ⁿ *Bouchier* doth vse the distinction of *primatiue* and *positiue* punishment, yet in the next Chapter he sheweth that *The iudgement of the Church may* be

be prevented, by the notoriouſnes of the crime : but how prevented? by onely a *primatiue puniſhment*, or onely by armes, for defence? No, he is not contented with a Buckler of defence, but he putteth a ſword in mens handes for to kill euen before iudgement, ſaying that they are taught out of *Deut. 13. Statim interficere*, *Preſently to kill*; adding the examples of *Phinnces killing the Iſraelite*, *Num. 25.* and of *Mattathias killing the Kings Captains*, *1. Machab. 2.* Next he ſeeketh to eſtabliſh the Acte of killing by a Canon, *That bee who falleth into a crime, which is condemned by the Canon, may without further iudgment be held condemned by the ſentence of the Canon.* Thus farre of the proceeding by Eccleſiaſticall cenſure.

M. Parsons in-
excusable
falſhood.

19. In the fourth Chapter he entreth the ſame queſtion concerning execution before publique iudgement. *Shall we think* (ſaith he) *that ſecular men in their proceedings in iudgement ought to be more religious, or cautelous, then the Eccleſiaſticall, as that they ought to expect that publicke iudgement (as Politicians teach) before that they may ſet upon a Tyrant by armes?* Immediately to prooue that they ought not to expect any publicke iudgement, he ſaith that in ſuch a caſe *If publicke iudgement may not be had, the ſafety of the Common-wealth is to be ſought by other meanes whatſoeuer, euen as againſt an armed theife.* And if any, whom he calleth Tyrants, ſhall happen to be ſlaine in ſuch inſurrections, *Who* (ſayth he) *will denie, but they are juſtly ſlaine?* In the fiſt Chapter he giueth an inſtance in *Henr. 3.* King of France, who was murdered by *Iacob Clement* a Friar: which fact *Bonchier* in the cap. 23. of the ſame booke doth highly commend as *meritorious*. Is heere *M. Parsons*, eyther *ſaluſum* or *nihil*? Is it nothing to arme Subiects againſt Kings, before publique iudgement? Is it nothing ſo to arme them, as, if they kill ſuch Kings, to holde the ſact lawfull and *meritorious*? If there had beene any tincture of truth in you, you could not haue objected *falſity* vnto mee againſt ſo many and ſo plaine inſtances and examples.

P Cap. 4. p. 358.

20. I call them *plaine*, becauſe *Bonchier* is challenged by your own Doctor *Barclains*, euen for the ſame matter: *Thom teacheth* (ſaith *Barclay* vnto *Bonchier*) *there, that it is lawfull*

¶ *Barcl. l. 5. contra Monarchom*
to c. 6. p. 361.

to kill Henry the third, King of Fraunce. It had beene therefore safer for M. Parsons his conscience, to haue answered *Nihil*, then to haue answered *Falsum*, that he is conuicted by the iudgement of their owne *Barclay*: which is likewise the censure of their owne Priest in the *Quodlibets*, saying, that In the Treatises de iusta Abdic. Henr. 3. they affirme that it is lawfull to kill a Tyrant, for so they termed that King, although there be neyther sentence of Church, nor King done against him. The case thus standing, we may thinke that Mr. Parsons his guiltinesse concerning the matter, did driue his penne awry to wrangle careely about wordes.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reck. pag. 323.

THE adding these wordes (which I say by common consent) is an accessory vncertainty, for excuse whereof he runneth to other Chapters, wherein he saith that *Bouchier* auoucheth, *Mirum esse in affirmando consensum*, that there is a wonderfull consent in allowing this doctrine. But these are other matters vpon other occasions, &c.

The Review.

21. If this was spoken of other matters, which were impertinent, why did you not name them? I suspect you haue found some reason: for, indeede, in his third booke and cap. 15. his position is this, viz. That it is lawfull to kill a Tyrant; which (saith he) it is marueilous what a great consent it hath not onely of prophane, but euen of our owne Authours. Which is the very ground and basis of all his former conclusions. And could you, M. Parsons, with any truth, signifie that this was vpon other impertinent matters?

SECT. III.

The fourth testimony of M. Raynolds.

22. THE testimony of M. Raynolds, and the censure thereof M. Parsons calleth againe into question so rigidly and scorne-

scornefully, as if both his wit and malice had conspired together, by virulency and scurrility, to make the matter incomparably odious; telling vs that at the hearing of the word *Suggestion* he *imagined*, and that (as he saith) *truely*, that I would haue confessed the *Dinell* to haue beene my Suggester: wherein the Iouiall and Iocular olde man meant onely to make himselfe and his Reader sport, and intended in this play, as it were, not to be without a *Dinell* and a vice; the first onely to be *imagined*, but the other to be acted by himselfe, and all this to prouoke vnto laughter. But the Greeke Prouerbe, *γερὰς χορὴν*, that is, *The old-wife danceth*, is verified in him: for our Reader may easily perceiue how little this first part of M. Parsons his play doth become him, if he shal but consider how Pope *Alexander* the third, ^b acknowledged himselfe to be subiect to wrong *Suggestions* and Informations: And that their own secular Priests haue no other way, to excuse the violent proceeding of their Pope *Pius Quintus* against the *Q. of England*, then by telling vs that hee was stirred vp by wrong *Suggestions*. Would it now become M. Parsons, who is a Romish Priest, by the strength of his *imagination* to thinke and that *Truely* (as he saith) that these Popes would confesse hereupon, that they receiued sometimes their intelligences, *Insinuations* and *Suggestions* from the *Dinell*? Or would not any Priest at the first hearing of this asseueration of M. Parsons saying, *Truely*, &c. acknowledge that in this first word he had committed a *True-lye*?

23. Afterwards he himselfe offereth (by I know not what suggestion) to spell two dumb Characters, bewraying thereby his personall malice; especially considering that the common letters in themselves might as easily represent *Robert Cowbucke*, as any other, in the which name M. Parsons himself was presented to Pope *Clement* the eighth, by the ^d *Declaration* of more then twenty Priests: Yet after his trifling hereabout he commeth to debate the matter it selfe.

M^r. PARSONS Reckoning.

H^eare, I pray you, his last shift: *Though not the place alleadged* (saith he) *yet the scope of M. Rainolds his whole booke doth conuince him of rebellious*

^a Reckon. cap. 5.
§. 4. pag. 316.

M. Parsons vnschemely scurrility.

^b Decret. l. 1. de Rescript. Tit. 3. cap. 5. Prauā insinuatione suggestum, &c.

^c Import. Consider. pag. 8.

^d P. Robertus Personus, aliis Cowbuccus, Iesuita praeceptorius &c. Declarat. motuum & perturb. inter. Iesuitas & Sacerdotes. pag. 23.

Reckon. pag. 331. & 332.

(b)

bellious doctrine, as will more plainly appeare in the Encounter. Make now whither he is fled de. He confesseth that in the place alleaged by Mr. Reynolds (whereabout onely stands our Controuersie) his drift was not to abase, but to exalt Princes authority, and consequently hee must graunt that he abused him in that crimination. But hee saith that the scope of his booke is otherwise, which he deferreth to prooue, vntill he make his larger Encounter, which I suppose, will require a large time.

The Reuiewe.

• Pag. 102.

M Parsons exceeding craft and deceit.

24. I rather suppose that you will thinke this Encounter came too soone, when you shall perceiue how you are charged hereby with manifold abuses, both of loose lying, and also of close and iniurious dissembling, of which kind you haue giuen vs a present example. For whereas (in my *Preamble*) I added a reason, why M. Reynolds might haue bene presumed to haue *Abused* the State of *Kings*, to wit, because in his Chapter next following he teacheth, that *Subiects may depose them*; and albeit Saint Peter taught *Subiection* vnto "Nero a Pagane and Sauage Tyrant, yet M. Reynolds holding "it to be *naturam generosorem*, that is, a more generous and "noble disposition to kill Tyrants, among whom he reckoned "K. Henry the eight: I hereupon inferred, that the scope of M. Reynolds his booke was to professe a doctrine rebellious: notwithstanding all which, M. Parsons conueigheth the matter, so cunningly and craftily, as though I had deferred all prooue vntill a *Large Encounter* should come forth. Therefore I may more then imagine, that this his Dissimulation was suggested vnto him by no good spirit.

25. Thus much of my Accuser, for now I enter vpon the Accusation it selfe, by performance of a more perfect discharge: to which purpose I shall desire Mr. Parsons, that wee may both betake our selues vnto our second thoughts, to consider more exactly the doctrine of Mr. Reynolds; so wee shal discern the censure which was giuen vpon that Author, how that notwithstanding his commendation of secular government, he ment to abase the authority which is due vnto a King, as may be evidently euinced by iust proofes. I shall but onely desire M. Parsons to vnderstand my Answer, and then

then he shall neede to require no more for this peece of his Reckoning.

A prooffe of M. Reynolds his abasement of the Royalty of Kings, both out of his owne doctrine, and out of the confessions of his owne Doctors.

26. M. Reynolds his doctrine, in that place alleadged, is plainly this: that in choosing any State of Gouvernement, whether it be *Monarchicall, or Aristocraticall, or Democraticall*; The consent of all people is the voice of nature: and that every such Election, by the consent of the people, is Approved by God; for although terren principality (saith he) be called by the Apostle (1 Pet. 2.) *An humane creature, because it is conferred vpon certain persons, by the suffrages & voices of the people, notwithstanding because that same election of Princes doth issue from nature, which God hath created, and from reason which is infused into man, therefore doth another Apostle plainly pronounce, saying (Rom. 13.) That ther is no power but from God, and that he that resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God.*

Reynolds in Rossio, p. 118.

27. This is the sentence which in outward shew (as I confessed) doth establish the dignity of Kings: but when we expound M. Reynolds by himselfe, hee will appeare not to have intended their due advancement: for in the very same Chapter he saith; when the People have created a King, the *Majestie of the King dooth depend vpon the will of the Commonwealth, which ordained him*: Inso much as that *They may depose their Kings*: and for example hee produceth *Henry of Navarre*, the now King of France, whom whilst hee was a Protestant M. Reynolds held to be an *Hereticke*, and worthy to be *Excommunicated by the Pope*; and consequently to be *Deposed by the French Catholikes*. Doe wee not now see plainly what kinde of *Creature* M. Reynolds his King must be, viz. such an one who shall not haue predominant power absolutely in himselfe, but dependantly of the people, by whom he may be created; and vncreated; as if the power were formally still in the people, and but onely instrumental-

*§ Pag. 10.
M. Reynolds
sentence of
detraction
from Regall
authority.*

*h Pag. 85.
i Pag. 139.*

The Evidence.

ly in the King. Can any deny but such a King fancied by M. *Reinolds* is but a flauish creature; and that in his pretense of commending the power of a King he intended closely to diminish and depreſſe his authority?

A confirmation
from their
owne Doctors.

^k *Barcla. cont.*
Monarch. lib. 3.
cap. 3.

^l The Authour
of the Booke
intituled, *Ve-*
riſimilia Theolo-
gica, Inuidica,
&c. pag. 155.
^m *Barcla. quo*
ſupra.

ⁿ *Ibid. lib. 4.*
^{*} *Lib. 4. cap. 4.*

^o *Marſil deſenſ.*
cont. Bellarm.
pag. 213.

28. Leſt perhaps any may doubt of this collection, I ſhall in the next place corroborate it by the ingenuous and euident confeſſion of their owne Doctors; their Doctor ^k *Barclay* (writing againſt theſe kinde of poſitions, and (as^l one obſerueth) againſt theſe their *Roſſam*, aliàs *Reinolds*, hath beſtowed a whole booke vpon this argument, prouing eſpecially that ^m *A King, although he be conſtituted by the people, yet being once conſtituted, he hath afterwards power to rule the people, and not to be ſubiect vnto them.* ⁿ *Who* (ſaith *Barclaius*) *although he be unworthy of his Kingdome, in reſpect of the Maieſty of God, vpon whom the Kingdome doth depend; yet in reſpect of the ſubiects he is alwaies ſuperiour, as long as he is a King.* And againe he elſewhere addeth that ^{*} *Kinges, who are lawfully conſtituted, albeit they fall to be cruell, yet are they aboue all lawes and iudgments of man, and cannot be hurt of any, without publike minny and treaſon.* And anſwering vnto this argument of *Boucher* (which is the ſame which Maſter *Reinolds* vrgeth) to wit; *The Common-wealth, which is the ſame as the people, (which made the King) is ſuperiour to the King, and the publike authority doth remaine in them. This reaſon* (ſaith he) *I haue proued many waies in many places to be lying and falſe.* His principall argument, to confute it, is that which their owne *Marſilius* hath lately vrged againſt *Bellarmino*. ^o *If* (ſaith he) *there remaine a power in the people to depoſe Princes, then Princes are no Princes, but ſubiects.* Now let *M. Parsons* gather his ſiue wits into one Senate, and anſwere, whether this confeſſion doe not plainly diſcouer, that the intendiment of *M. Reinolds* was to make a King a Subiect, which is as ſenſible an abaſement of a King, as can be imagined.

29. Although this may ſuffice both to repreſſe *M. Parsons* his inſolency, who inſulteth ſo deformedly vpon the former allegation, and alſo to reprove my negligence, who de-
ferred

ferred this Answer and Discharge, vntill the publishing of this *Encounter*, yet will I not forbear to enlarge my selfe in this argument, and by a further answer vnto his next objection, to cuince the foresaid vile estimate, which *M. Reynolds* had concerning the State of Kings and all Temporall Estates.

MR. PARSONS his Reckoning.

BUt what saith he for his (owne) defence? Vpon this presumption, *Reck. pag. 318.* if true (saith he) that *Mr. Reynolds* had spoken thus to the debasement of Kings, it could be no fallshood in me to adde the particle [but,] especially being acquainted with the doctrine of *Cardinal Bellarmine*, who that he might disable the authority of a King, in comparison of the dignity of a Pope, doth defend that *Kinges being chosen by men, are not immediately created by God: and yet the Pope, being elected by Cardinals, hath his authority immediately from God.* * Whereunto I answer, that well he might say so, for that Christ both God and Man did institute in particular and immediately the supreme authority of *S. Peter*, and his Successours, when he gaue to him, and by him to them the keyes of heauen: but he instituted not the authority of Kings immediately, but left by each people to be gouerned by what sort of gouernement they liked best, albeit where that forme of gouernement, or of any other (as of Dukes, Common-wealths, or the like) was once lawfully introduced, he commaunded due obedience to be performed thereunto. And although the Popes be chosen by Cardinals, who are men, yet is not their office, power, or authority chosen by, or appointed by those men, as in Kings, but immediately is of God, so as this hole will not serue *M. Mortons* turne for his excuse.

* *Reck. pag. 319.*

The Renew.

30. I say with our Sauour Christ that the *Foxes haue holes*, and so hath *M. Parsons*; p who hath taken an example from the instinct of nature in the *Foxe*, for iustifying his *Mental Equiuocation*; vvhose difference betweene the Popes and Princes authority from God, by *Bellarmino* his distinction of *mediately* and *immediately*, hath beene proued of late by their owne *Marfiline* to be a meere sophistical fallacy, and indeed no better then a *Fox-hole*, into which they doe creepe, who seeke by such a distinction, to diminish the Regall power, in respect of the Papall. I shall neede only to collect the summe of the confutation, because I presume, our Reader will not

M. Parsons and Bellarmines Sophistry.

¶ *Marfil. Defens.*
cont. *Bellar. c. 3.*
pag. 201.

Power of a
King immedi-
ately from
God.

A necessary di-
stinction be-
twene Title
and Power.

Bellarmino con-
futed by Mar-
filus.

like too long Reckoning. ¶ *Nanarrus*, a most sound Catho-
like (saith *Marfilus*) bouldeth that the power Laique is imme-
diately from God, infusing in people a naturall instinct to haue a
gouernement: And of Gouernements established, *The Apo-*
stle S. Paul saith (*Rom. 13.*) that the powers which be, are of
God. Seeing also that the lay Prince can make lawes, which
doe binde his subjects consciences to obserue them, therefore is
their authority not of man, but of God; whereupon the *Apostle*
addeth, [He that resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of
God;] and although the manner of obtaining a Kingdome be
from man, (This proueth *M. Rainolds* contrary estimate of a
King to haue beene but base) yet the authority and power is
immediately from God. A similitude whereof we haue in the
generation of enery man for although it be necessary that the bo-
dily Organs, instruments, and other naturall dispositions be first
perfected, before the soule is infused, yet will not any therefore
deny that God doth immediately infuse the reasonable soule of a
man into his body. As for his illustrious Lordship (meaning
Cardinall Bellarmine:) he erreth, first by not distinguishing be-
twene the Title of authority, and the authority it selfe, (An e-
uident conuiction both of *Bellarmino* and *M. Rainolds*.) For
the title vnto an authority is not without the meanes of man, but
the authority it selfe is immediately from God, as hath beene
expressed by the former similitude. Secondly, he erreth in saying
that all which dwell within the Princes territories, are not imme-
diately from God Subject vnto him, and yet all Christians are
immediately subject vnto the Pope; for as the Prince is not a
Prince without either right of his birth, or by election, &c. So
the Pope is not Pope but by the election of Cardinals. Thirdly,
he erreth in saying that when the Prince dieth, the authority re-
maineth in the common-wealth; especially, whereas the succession
is by election; but when the Pope dieth the power Papall remaineth
not in the Cardinals, who are to make an election, nor in the
Church; But the Doctors of the famous College of the Sorbonists
in Paris doe defend the contrary. Fourthly, he erreth in making
this difference betwene Prince and Pope, to wit, that the Title
of the Prince is but mediately, and the Title of the Pope is im-
mediately

mediately from God; if by the Title, he understand the manner of obtaining the authority, he erreth: for both the manner of the one, and of the other are equally humane, neither will the Conclavists themselves suffer me to be convinced of a lye in this point. Thus farre their owne *Marfilous*.

31. As for Bellarmine his imagination, who thinketh that in the vacancy of the See of Rome, by the death of the Pope, the keys or supreme authority, is neither in the Council, nor in the Cardinals, but in the handes of Christ, it is no better then a dreame, wherein he saw the keys, as it were, flying vp into heauen. For when the See was often void of a Pope (as their Historians recorde) the space of three or foure yeares, and sometime also for *Seauen*, or *Eight yeares together*, as some haue thought, dare any Romanists conceiue, that their Church was all that while destitute of the keys of spiritual Jurisdiction?

32. Finally, because *M. Parsons* plaieeth the flesh-flye, delighting himselfe with sucking of but seeming corruptions, I must direct him vnto the examples of his owne friendes aboue mentioned, to wit, *Suarez*, *Bellarmino*, *Baronius*, *Boucher*, *Gratian*, &c. in whom their owne Doctours haue spied diuers vlcereous putrefactions of true and notorious falsifications, by *allcaging authors flat contrary to their meanings*; with which loathsome matters his corrupt appetite may satiate it selfe. One example of this kinde, offereth it selfe out of *Bellarmino*, which I may not let passe: whome *P. Paulus* hath confuted for abusing a sentence of *Gerfon*, by so inuerting the sense thereof, as: *that which Gerfon said in fauour of the authority of the Roman See, the Author (meaning Bellarmine) changing the wordes, doth interpret as spoken in contempt. Is this to dispute, (saith P. Paulus) or to deceive? I know not what the Author, (to wit, Bellarmine,) can answer.* And when *M. Parsons* hath considered this, let him tell vs in good earnest whether he will stand vnto his owne *Rule of Penance*, against any one who shall be found guilty of so notorious a falshood, that he *never be trusted hereafter*? I forbear to mention his owne falsifications, because he expecteth an example

* Card. Cusan.
Concord. Cathol. lib. 3. c. 41.
Post Marcellinum
Papatum vacasse septem
annis.

† Sunt qui scribunt, post mortē
Nicolai primi
Sedem vacasse
annis octo mensibus septem.
Platina in vita
Nicolai primi.
* See aboue.
cap. 1.

† P. Paulus Apolog. pro Gerfone
cont. Bellar.
pag. 569.
Bellarmines apparant & confessed falshood
" Reck pag. 328.

example of any one, who hath the degree of *Prelacy* in their Church.

SECT. V.

The first charge: concerning the testimony out of Gratian, for paying of debts.

33. **T**O shew that, by their doctrine, they will pleade freedom from paying of debts vnto such persons, whom they shall excommunicate, the Gloss of a Canon was alleaged by R. S. and mistaken; but yet only in part, for ^{a Preamb. p. 105} "their Iesuit *Tolet* ^a expoundeth that *Canon*, and an other of "non-payment of debts, which are made by promise. And now *M. Parsons* beginneth to play his prizes, and to haue about with two at once.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reck. pag. 333. WE may see how poore men in substance our Ministers are, who double thus.

The Renewwe.

34. Hath R. S. mistaken this one place? and hath neuer any Romish Priest beene found so culpable, as to mistake an obiection for the resolution? We ^b haue heard the complaint, which their owne Doctor *Cumel* made against certaine Romish writers, such as were the Iesuit *Suarez*, and others, saying, *I am grieved to see how falsly they alleage Driedo, urging that, which he spake by way of argumentation, or obiection, for his owne iudgement.* And *M. Parsons* himselfe, who is the accuser, must necessarily runne vpon his owne blade of reproch, who ^c called an *Interrogation*, made for the more sensible introduction of the matter, a *crafty and hypocriticall silence and dissimulation.*

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reck. p. 339-340 Mr. *Stock* alleageth the Canon it selfe, making his Inference thus: *This is the decree, which in generall carrieth as much, or more as is set downe.*

^a See aboue.
Cap. 1.

Romists overtaken in the guilt, which they impute to others.

^c See aboue.
Cap. 12. §. 8.

downe. Make that he saith, that it carrieth as much in generall: but generalities are not sufficient to auouch particulars. This Canon doth prohibit obedience to be exhibited to excommunicate persons, vntil they doe conforme themselves: it speaketh nothing of debts; how shall we trie it first by the wordes themselves, wherein there is no mention at all of debts: and for that cause it is probable that *Mr. Stock* was ashamed to English them, as *M. Morton* before to recite them. Secondly, by the Commentary, or Glosse, whose wordes are plaine, *Licet excommunicatio tollat obligationem, quoad fidelitatem, non tamen quoad alios contractus*: albeit excommunication doe take away obligation of fidelity, or subiection towards the person excommunicated, yet not in other contracts: so as if I doe owe to an excommunicate person, money, I am bound to pay him. Thus doth the Glosse expound the Canon, and the *scaberd* doth agree with the *sword*, and both of them doe hurt *Mr. Morton*, and *M. Stock*, though neuer so good fencers in a badde cause.

The Reueiue.

35. Although we two should seeme too weake for this *M. Parsons*, who maketh himselfe greater then an *Hercules*: yet it may be we shall ouer-match him, when we adioyne vnto our small force the help of their owne *Card. Tolet*, who citing these two Canons, to wit, *Nos Sanctorum*, and Canon *Iuratos* saith ^d *These Canons doe proceede concerning debts, yet not debts which are reall* (meaning, by Bill, or Bond) *but debts contractea by promise*. This exposition of their owne Cardinall, and sometime Iesuit, doth not only ward *M. Parsons* his blow, but also driueth it to his owne pate, by controuling the audaciousnesse of his answer, wherein he denied that there is signified any *non-payment* of debts in this Canon.

^d *Tolet. Instruct. Sacerd l. 1. c. 13. §. Sixtus. M. Parsons confuted by their Card. Tolet.*

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

M^r. *Stock* goeth further to alleage an other beginning of a Canon, *Absolutes se nouerint*, which was made by *Gregory* the ninth. Wherein the very same thing is decreed, as in the other; wherein there is no mention of debts, although, by occasion of this decree, a certaine Glosse, which is of *Bernardus de Buttono Parmensis*, doth probably hold that to such a man there is not obligation of payment of debt (at leastwise of such debts as are only contracted by promises, but are not reall debts) so long as he remaineth in that case. And to this effect also speaketh *Tolet* in the place here cited by *M. Morton*, and we haue

Reck. pag. 340. 341. Greg. 9. Decret. l. 5. Tit. 7. c. 16.

haue heard before how the other Glosse of *Bartholomæus Brixienfis* held it for probable, though the contrary for more true, vpon the Canon, *Nos Sanctorum*.

The Reuiewe.

The mystery of
non payment
of debts made
by promise.

36. Well then, their Card. *Tolet*, and *Romane Glossers* haue held it lawfull for men to with-hold their debtes contracted onely by promise (which may passe without witnesse) from persons excommunicate. But why onely these kinde of debts made onely by promise? Is there, in respect of God, more iustice in a mans letters, then in his wordes? in his hand, then in his tongue? in his specialties by billes and bonds, then in his obligation by promise? no, but it is rather, as it may seeme, because the Creditor hath not so good euidence before men, to clayme his debt by word, as he hath by writing; wherefore the *Romish Canon* sauoureth rather of humane craft, then of good conscience; and is farre vnworthy the title of *Nos Sanctorum*. But let vs proceede.

SECT. VI.

The sixth charge taken by *M. Parsons* against *R.S.*
about another Canon.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reck. pag. 374.

VE must call him (namely *R.S.*) backe againe for cyting the Glosse *apud Gratianum*, that is, in the Decrees collected by *Gratian*, which is not there, but in the Decretals of Pope *Greg. 9.* gathered by *Raymundus Barcionensis*. And the Authour of that Glosse was *Bernardus de Buttono*.

The Reuiewe.

37. This exception, taken from the difference of Glosses vpon the Popes Decrees, which were gathered by *Gratian*; and betweene the Glosse vpon the Popes Decretals, whose

AU.

Author was *Bernardus de Buttono*, is not worth a button : seeing the argument, which was vsed by *Mr. S.* consisted not vpon the authority which the Collectors, or Glossers had in themselves, but from the common approbation, which they receiued in the Romane Church. The matter, which principally was to be insisted vpon, followeth in the next Inquiry.

An Inquiry by a logicall Racke.

38. Whereas the Canon of killing of Heretickes is mentioned among the Popes Decretals, authorized by Pope Gregory the ninth in my *Preamble*, I demaunded of *M. Parsons* in this manner : If Romish ones applying this Canon (of murdering their kindred, &c) against Protestants, when the Pope shall iudicially denounce them Heretickes, whether it may be called a Massacre, or no? I haue now my *Mitigator* vpon a Logick racke; eyther he must say, that it is no bloody massacre, but Catholicke iustice : and then what shall his Reader thinke of his *Mitigation* otherwise then of *Indas* his lippes in kissing, and yet betraying his Master? and if he hold it an execrable mischiefe, then how shall he iustifie the application of this Canon, when the Pope shall extend it against Protestants? He cannot answer directly, but he must manifest himselfe eyther a Traytor to his Country, or a preuaricator to his cause. ^f Yet consider how zealous *P. R.* is in authorizing that Canon: to what end can this be, but that Protestants, being in their opinion Hereticks, may haue al the penalties, which are awarded against Hereticks, executed vpon them (as *Boucher* and others defend) before or at least (as *P. R.* holdeth) after denunciation of sentence? And consequently Protestants may bee by these Romish ones, without exception of sexs or kindred, or friendship, as it was by execution in the cruell Massacre in *Fraunce*, and by intention in the powder-treason, vtterly consumed at once. Doe not these demands require a plaine, full, and satisfiable account? yet now marke, and maruell at his answer.

Popes Canons
of killing of
Heretiques.
* *Pream. p. 107.*

A Dilemma.

f Pream. p. 108.

*g See Tbuanus
hist. lib. 52.*

Mr.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reck. pag 349.

VV Hereunto I answer, that the demand is foolish, and not worthy the answering at all: for that the like odious demands may be made about the execution of all criminall lawes. And it is a token that M. Morton is at a *non-plus*, when he seeketh to entertaine time in these impertinencies.

The Reuiewe.

39. At a *Non-plus* Mr. Parsons? surely if I were not so then, yet may I now be, but neuer for want of Argument in this case, but by reason of astonishment to see such an Answer as this is, wherby any Reader (who hath any apprehension of a consequence) may see and groape, and sensibly fee the beating of your rebellious pulse. For whereas the booke of the *Discovery of Romish positions and practises for rebellion*, was written onely to manifest in how desperate a State all Protestant Kings stood in, whensoever the Romish power might preuaile against them: and your Answer hereunto in your booke of *Mitigation*, intended wholly to mitigate the bitterness of the objected positions, and to assuage the iea-lousie of the State, by pretending a *possibility* (but yet onely a possibility) of a *peaceable conversation in this Kingdome*. Yet now, where a demand is made, whether it be not the full intendment and resolution of all Romish Professors, to execute your Canon of *Killing Heretickes* vpon Protestants, whensoever an expected possibility of effectuating such an exploit, shall be offered: and when hereby being vrged and importuned to giue vs a plaine and direct Answer, euen as you wil be thought not to haue iustified cyther the Massacring of Protestants in Fraunce; or that late barbarous, or rather Trayterous and hellish *Powder-treason* in England; yet now wee can haue no other Answer for our satisfaction, but to say that the *Demand is foolish, odious, and impertinent*.

40. This Reckoning is able (I confesse) at the first to driue a man vnto a *non-plus*, thorow an amazement to heare so prodigious an Answer: Yet so, that therein he may see sufficient

M. Parsons his
vngodly si-
lence Betray-
eth his whole
pretence of
their loyalty in
the States of
Protestants.

ent matter (if there were none other argument in all the booke) to prooue *M. Parsons* (when he taketh vpon him the name of a *Mitigator*, and *Sober Reckoner*) to bee no better then the deceitfull Apothecarie , who writ *Opium* vpon a boxe of *Opium* : And what is this his concalement else , but a kind of confession, iustifying the former booke of *Discovery*; the scope whereof was onely this, to proue the Romish doctrine to be a profession of Conspiracie in Protestant Kingdomes ?

41. This matter may be illustrated by a similitude, viz. *M. Parsons* and some other are to trauell together, and their way lyeth thorow a desert, much haunted with theeues ; the honest man is desirous of *M. Parsons* his fellowship in that trauell, swearing vnto him that for his part he will be true vnto him, and hazard his life in resisting all violence, that shall bee offered against them in the iourney, and exacteth of *M. Parsons* the like promise, saying : Sir , will you sweare to bee true vnto me likewise, or if your heart will not serue you to fight , will you promise not to betray me? and then he should heare *M. Parsons* answer only by calling that demaund *odious, foolish and impertinent* ; might he not iustly suspect that hee had met with a treacherous companion, and forthwith desire his lesse Acquaintance ?

A Similitude:

42. So likewise the whole Controuersie , which *M. Parsons* and I haue taken in hand to debate, is onely this, whether the Romanists will by Oath professe so full a league offriendly and Christian conuersation with Protestants in their Kingdomes, as to defend each other from forraine inuasions, and to appease and suppress to their power, all intestine seditions and rebellions against the publique State ; or else , at least, not to conspire together to the cutting of throats ; yet now *M. Parsons* answering in the name of all Romanists , will allow vs no better satisfaction, then (as we haue heard) to call the Demaund *odious, foolish and impertinent*.

43. By this time wee haue a reasonable vnderstanding of *M. Parsons* his Answer, who hearing vs as it were questioning, and demanding of him, saying : Sir, whether will you

kill vs, if you had vs in your power, or no? thought it was not for his purpose to answer no, for then must hee condemne their Romish positions and practises, which haue sounded out so many allarums of warre and bloodshed; neyther durst he say yea, for then he must recant his former booke of *Mitigation*, and cancell the summe of this his present *Reckoning*, which doth make, at least, some semblance of a *peaceable conversation*; and therefore he thought it a point of wisdom to call it *foolish*, as though he would teach vs to be as wise as *dones*, whilst he and his Complices may remaine as innocent as *Serpents*. Here *M. Parsons* may bee serued indeede with a *Nihil dicis*, but such an one, which conteyneth in it an *Omnia dicis*, for it is all one as a confession of all the former charges of seditious doctrine, which I haue objected against them.

44. I should passe on to that which followeth, but that I may not denie *M. Parsons* the due commendation of his wit, who finding himselfe plunged with the former *Demand* concerning their reall shedding and spilling of blood, dooth call this objection *impertinent*, and presently diuerteth his Reader to a verball and idle contention about the difference of these two phrases *Shedding* and *Spilling* (which may be vsed promiscuously:) as though his question about wordes were *pertinent*, and my *Demand* about deedes were *Impertinent*.

45. I added in the *Preamble* that *M. Parsons* affirmed
Preamb. p. 108. "the aforesaid Canon to haue bene in the Councel of Carthage,
 "where (said I) there is no such thing to be found: and hereupon
 am called to a further examination.

MR. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reck. pag. 351.

It is most apparant, and may be inuicibly prooued against him: for
 first the Canon it selfe beginneth thus: *Si quis Episcopus, &c.*

The Review.

46. Our question was about *Shedding of blood*, which was
Preamb. p. 108. objected as out of their Gloss. *This Gloss* (said *M. Parsons*)
 or *Commentary* of the Canon law, is vpon a Canon beginning,
 Si

Si quis, &c. which Canon is taken out of the Councel of Carthage: where indeede there is mention of *Dis-inheriting of children*, but no word at all concerning *Shedding of blood*: accordingly as I then intended to proue, as may well appeare.

His extrauagancie.

SECT. VII.

The seuenih Charge.

47. **N**OW commeth in the citation of the Extrauag. in a general implying the Glosse, wherunto I haue answered that ¹ Gregory the thirteenth hath ratified the fore-said Glosse and Annotations, with priuiledge and authority, equivalent and answerable to the authority of the *Decretals*, and *Extravagants* themselves. Now followeth the brieft of

¹ Pream. p. III.

¹ Greg. 13. ad futuram rei memoriam, &c

MR. PARSONS his Reckoning.

THIS is a shamelesse assertion, to say that the Glosses and Annotations haue beene equally warranted by Pope Gregory, as are the Constitutions. Pope Greg 13. prefixed an Epistle before the Decretals with this title, *Ad futuram rei memoriam*, wherein he giueth license to *Paulus Constabilis Magister sacri palatii* to reuiewe the same, and to print it exactly, according to the Romane example. From whence M Morton would inferre, that he commanded them to be printed without corruption, therefore he made them equall.

Reckon. cap. 5. § 7 pag. 355.

The Reuiewe.

48. The former Decree of Greg. 13. standeth thus, concerning Decrees, and Glosses, the *Sextum, Clementines*, and *Extravagants*; Which we commend (saith Pope Greg.) unto our beloved sonne, to be reuiewed and allowed: And a little after: Which we command to be printed and published, that the body of the Canon law may be faithfully and incorruptly printed, according to the Copie which is printed at Rome, for the better helpe of all faithful Christians whomsoever. In this Constitution heere is mention of Decrees, Glosses, *Sextum, Clementines*, and *Extravagants*,

The authority of the Romish Glosse vpon the Decrees, and Decretals, &c.

negants: where we see that *Glosses* doe possesse the second place: And was the Pope thus religious to provide for *All faithfull Christians*, least any of them might possibly be poysoned with a corrupt Text, and would he not haue the like care that the *Glosse* should be perfect, which being *false* (according to the Prouerbe) *doth corrupt the Text*.

49. In the same Constitution *Greg.* saith, as followeth: *We provide that this body of the law may passe purged, sound, and safe, that it may not be lawfull for any man to adde any thing, or change it, or ioyn any interpretation vnto it: Therby forbidding only new Interpretations*, for the old *Glosses* and Interpretations do stand still warranted ioyntly with the Text and body of the Canons. If therefore the Pope thoght those *Glosses* mentioned in the Constitution to be corrupt, why did he authorize them? if he iudged them to be perfect, how did he not authorize them? And who can conceiue any inequality in the Popes approbation of these things, seeing that both *Decrees* and *Glosses*, &c. are without any note of difference warranted in the same Constitution at the same time, *Anno 1580.* by the same power of Pope *Gregory 13.* and to the same end for the helpe of *faithfull Christians*.

50. Neuerthelesse it is an hard thing (I confesse) for any man to vnderstand precisely when, and how the thing is ple-
narily and fully authorized by the Popes Decree, for in their last Councell of *m Trent* it was decreed, that there should be *One authenticall vulgar Edition of the Bible, which none might presume to reiect*: yet that which was called then [*The vulgar Edition*] hath since that time beene twise diuersly corrected: once by Pope *Sixtus Quintus*, and after by Pope *Clement the eight*, euen with contradictory approbations. Neyther seemeth it vnto their owne Iesuits to be so perfect, but that they dare reprehend it: their Iesuite *n Maldomate*, saying of one place that *It is to be corrected by the Greeke*; the Iesuite *o Ribera* affirming of another place, that *It ought to be according to the Greeke*; their Iesuite *p Salmeron* affirming of another place, that *Without doubt this word were better left out*: besides the diuers other corrupt peeces of that Translation, which

m Sess. 4.

The dubious authority of their vulgar Romish Translation of the Bible.

n Mald. Iesin Matth. 6.5.

o Ribera Iesin Heb. 4.2.

p Salmeron Ies. in Iac. 5.16.

which, by the confession of some other Romish Doctors, haue occasioned corruption in doctrine, as I elsewhere hath
 beene discouered. But *M. Parsons* is ready to pose me. ¶ Catholike
appeale, Lib. 4.
cap. 18. §. 3.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

IF *Queene Elizabeth* did approue the Printing of the English new Testament with *Bezaes* notes, did shee thereby equall the said notes with the Text of the Testament it selfe? Who would reason so, or who would goe about to abuse his Reader and himselfe, that had care of conscience or credit? Reck. pag. 356.

The Reuerſe.

51. This *Simile* is *disſimile*, and an vnlikely comparison, for our Aduerſaries know right well, that we doe not attribute vnto either King or Queene that infallibility of iudgement, which they doe vnto the Pope; so that the disproportion of this comparison appeareth herein, because we discern betweene *Scriptures* and the *Annotations*, (by whomsoever they be approued) as betweene the *word of God*, and *Mans opinion*. But the Romanists, who hold the iudgment of the Pope in all things, which he shall publicly decree for the good of all *Christians*, to be diuinely true, must therefore intertaine with equall faith the *Decretals* and *Glosses*, because they haue beene reuiwed and approued with the same authority. I hasten to heare my next Charge. M. Parsons his
frothy argument.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

HE was charged with adding the wordes of *Apostata Princes*, not found at all in the *Glosse*, yet may the matter in the *Glosse* be extended vnto them. He also cut off the last wordes of the sentence, *Nisi unicum*; What neede these nibblings? Reck. pag. 357.

The Reuerſe.

52. Nay rather what neede these iugglings, which *M. Parsons* vsith, who knowing that the wordes of *Apostata Princes* M. Parsons false
iuggling.

(k)

* Satisfact. part.

3 pag. 34.

* Preamb. pag. 111.

* Preamb. pag.

111. 112.

His notable
fraude.

u In Extrauag.
comm. lib. 1. de
Maior. & Obed.
cap. 1.

A false and
bloudy Glossie
in the Extra-
uagants.

Princes were not my *Additions*, but the * Obiection of *M. Parsons* owne fellow, the namelesse Authour of the *Apology of the English Catholikes*, cap. 5. as I did † shew him, and he could not denie : yet doth he wilfully runne vpon the same straine, a note beyond true sobriety, especially seeing that he also confesseth that in true sense the *Glosse* did extend vnto *Apostata Princes*.

53. In the † same place I furthermore iustified the relating of testimonies of Authours, according to their sense, without the precise repetition of their wordes, by the example of their owne Pope in his alleaging of Scripture *Deut. 13.* but *M. Parsons* (which is fraude indeede) hath peremptorily condemned me, without confutation, yea or so much as mention of that answer.

54. Finally, I was so farre from iniurying the *Glosse*, in hope of any aduantage, that now (considering the peruerfnesse of my Aduersary) I cannot but be offended with my selfe for loosing my best aduantage, in not expressing the * *Glosse* to the full, because the wordes following will sufficiently manifest the *Glosse* to be (which was the matter intended) both sacrilegious and rebellious. *As Iesus by his naturall right* (saith the *Glosse*) *might enter into iudgement*, and pronounce the sentence of deposing an Emperour, or any other person, so also may his Vicar, meaning the Pope. Which assertion is so grossly false, that their owne late and learned Doctors doe greatly abhorre it, as hereafter will fully appeare.

S E C T. VIII.

The eight Inquiry.

55. *Campian*, *Genebrard*, *Canisius*, and diuers other Romish Doctors with maine force fell vpon *Caluin*,
“and laide vnto his charge no lesse then impiety, heresie,
“and blasphemy, becaufe of his opinion of *aduersion*. *Bellar- mine*,

"mine, howsoever he condemned the phrase, did notwithstanding iustifie the meaning of *Caluin*, and iudged it to be *Catholike*. Which I^a produced to the iust reproofe of their malice, who haue so vnconscionably traduced the doctrine of *Caluin*. Preamb p. 112

MR. PARSONS his Reckoning.

I Handled this matter before: albeit *Bellarmino* teach, that in some sense it may be truly said that *Christ* is God of himselfe, yet absolutely doth he condemne the speech of *Caluin* herein. * Seeing *Bellarmino* condemned *Caluin*, quoad modum loquendi, in his manner of speech, which he proueth Hereticall by foure sorts of arguments; Why had not *M. Morton* so much as mentioned this condemnation by *Bellarmino*, seeing it imported the matter so mightily? Which is sufficient to argue the faulty minde of the corrupter. Reck. pag 358.

* Reck. ibidem pag. 363.

The Reniewe.

56. Surely *M. Parsons* is a mighty Questionist: *Caluin* called *Christ* *αὐτοθεός*, *Bellarmino* condemned the phrase of *Caluin*, but iustified his meaning against some Romish Doctors, who had wickedly imputed *Heressie* and *Blasphemy* vnto *Caluins* iudgment: And *M. Parsons* asketh why I mentioned not *Bellarmines* condemnation of the phrase, as well as his iustification of the meaning? I answered, I was to deale with the kernell; and left the shell for him to exercise his teeth withall; and knowing that *Heressie* consisteth not in the word, but in the sense (as I haue^b proued) I omitted the contention about that word: which notwithstanding might haue bene iustified, against *Bellarmino*, by the equivalent^c phrases of auncient Fathers *αὐτοθεός*, *αὐτοθεὸς*, *αὐτοθεός*, and such like, which argue *M. Caluins* aduersaries to be but mighty wranglers, as hath bene more amply proued^{*} heretofore, where *M. Parsons* is found to be the corrupter not of Authours wordes, but of their confessed meanings in this point: who beeing vnable to oppose any materiall thing against me, riotteth about the omission of *Hoc errore*, *This error*,

M. Parsons his vnwise dema^d. *Caluin* his iudgment iustified by *Bellarmino*.

^b See aboue. cap. 12. n. 27.

^c *Daneus Resp.* ad *Bellar.* contra. 2. lib. 20. cap. 19.

* See aboue.

errori, albeit the question were only of *This error*, and none other: and then for saying *Illos*, for, *Illum*, although I was licensed thereunto by *Bellarmino* himselfe, who ioyned both *Caluin*, and two other Protestants, as namely *Beza* and *Simlerus*, together, whose iudgment in the same point he did likewise approue. So that a man would imagine, that *M. Parsons* was scarce either *hic*, or *ille*, when, for want of matter of exception, he reeled vpon *illos* and *hoc*.

S E C T. IX.

The ninth Charge.

^d See this aboue. cap. 12.

THis is about the ^d Text of the Prophet *Esay Chap. 29. vers. 9. They are blinde and make others blinde.*

M^r. PARSONS *his Reckoning.*

Reck. pag. 364.

I Noted him only for false alleaging, corrupting, and mangling this place: the Reader will see my reason, by looking vpon the Text: And how little he hath beene able to say for himselfe, in iustification of his fancy, may be seene in the Chapters before mentioned, and so we passe to an other, as trifling as this.

The Reniew.

57. *M. Parsons noted me* (as he saith) *for false alleaging, corrupting, and mangling* that text of Scripture, and hath shewne himselfe thereby a notorious malicious man, as I haue fully euicted: shewing first that I corrupted not the Text, but alleaged it as it is found in our common English translation. Secondly, prouing that the same translation is iustificable both in *wordes and sense*. And whereas *M. Parsons* in his *Mitigation* did vehemently pursue me, saying, *I cannot easily pretermitt, &c.* Now in this Reckoning he is willing partly to pretermitt his owne error, calling the matter a *trifling*, as he vseth to doe, when he is deprehended in a voluntary deceit.

^e See aboue.

cap. 12. num. 41.

^f *Mitigat. p. 88.*

S E C T.

SECT. X.

The tenth Charge.

THIS is touching two wordes of some affinity, *verò*, and *verè*: whereof we haue discussed before.

§ See this aboue. cap. 12. num. 47.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

THIS is also a Colewort twice already sodden, whereof I spake but a word or two in my Treatise of *Mitigation*, censuring it for a trifle: and now *M. Marion* hath so stretched out the matter, for that he may seeme to haue some little patronage for his errour, by the later errour of an other print.

Reck. cap. 5. §. 10. pag. 365.

The Review.

§ 8. Now since that *M. Parsons* hath scene, by the last *Preamble*, his owne rash, vile, and slanderous accusation detected, he can be contented that his Reader may thinke, that he censured me for that pretended abuse only in a word, or two, that is, not rigorously, but remissely, as a man of sobriety would doe any *Trifling matter*: but I, who tasted his gall cannot so easily forget the bitterneesse of his inuectiue; who made his exclamation against me thus: *And where is now the assurance of his upright conscience protested in his Epistle "Dedicatory? Where is his simplicity in Christ Iesus? where is his naked innocence? can this be ignorance? can this be done but of a guilty conscience? what may we beleene of all that he saith, when he seeth himselfe intangled with such foolish treachery? Thus farre M. Parsons. And couldest thou conceiue otherwise (good Reader) by this hue and crye, but that I had beene guilty at least of some periury or sacrilege, or blasphemy, notwithstanding now he confesseth that it is but a trifling matter, and is willing to thinke that it was vrged against me vpon a false surmise? Here we see that his trifling*

M. Parsons former grievous slander partly confessed and thoroughly discovered.
h *Mitigat.* p. 134

coleworts were first sodden in vinegre and gall, euen in the bitternesse of his malicioufnesse, but now he is content to mingle oyle with it, being in part ashamed of his former cookery.

M. Parsons exquisite fraudulency in couering his falsehood.

59. Ncuerthelesse, whereas *M. Parsons* hath not prosecuted any one taxation against me, either in his former booke of *Mitigation*, or in this his new *Reckoning* with more variety and virulency of wordes, then he hath done this his *Trifling*, rash, and lying slander, euery word peircing to the very soule, saying, *Where is his conscience? where is his simplicity in Christ Iesus? where his innocencie? here is his guiltinesse, and here his treachery*: yet now shameth not to say (as though he had not greatly vrged that point against me) that he passed ouer the matter *in a word, or two*. Much like as one, who after he had peirced a man into his braines, and stabbed him at the very hart with many a mortall wound, should excuse himselfe, saying, I gaue him but a *Trifling* blow, *or two*.

SECT. XI.

The cleauenth Charge.

60. **C**ONCERNING the doctrine of *Doleman*, houlding it a damnable sinne for any Romanist to admit a Protestant Prince vnto the Crowne. Which I haue answered, and (as I hope) satisfied: but yet *M. Parsons* hath found out some other odde endes to be reckoned for.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

*Reck. cap. 5.
S. 11. pag 366.*

I Deny that either the true wordes or sense of *Doleman* was related by him, and consequently he cannot be excused from a witting falsehood.

The Renew.

61. Who is this that accuseth me? *M. Parsons*: in whose behalfe? in the behalfe of *Doleman*, alias, *M. Parsons*: for what?

what? for accusing Mr. *Parsons* to haue held it a damnable sinne for any of his Catholiques to admit any Protestant vnto the Crowne of England: which notwithstanding was procured by the force of a Syllogisme, concluding thus, *Ergo Dolman*, aliàs, *M. Parsons* held it a damnable sinne for any Romish Professour to admit a Protestant to the Crowne. But since that *M. Parsons* tooke a surfeit of his owne foolish Syllogisme, the consequence of Syllogismes could not wel relish in his mouth. Secondly this sense is so euident, that their owne Priests haue called that booke intituled *Dolman*, a *Trayterous, Seditious and most infamous booke* against the English State, which is so euident, that whosoeuer shall but reade that booke, may see that if *M. Parsons* his own conscience could be heard speake, we should neede neyther the confession of their own Priests, nor the consequence of *M. Parsons* to make vp the conclusion.

M. Parsons defendeth that booke which hath beene accounted rebellious by their owne Priest.

Important Consider. in the Epist. Dedicat. And see the like confessed aboue.

S E C T. XII.

The twelfth Charge.

MR. PARSONS his Reckoning.

THis imputation was about false dealing on *M. Mortons* behalfe, in setting downe in generall, that *All Popish Priests doe abolish the succession of all Protestant Princes, upon the pretence of prerogative in Pope and people*. Wherein he is conuicted of diuers falshoods, handled before by vs, in the first Chapter.

Reck. cap. 5. §. 12. pag. 367.

The Reniewe.

62. I answere, that if I haue beene iustly conuicted, nay if I haue not beene iniuriously traduced by *M. Parsons* in this matter, then shal I subiect my selfe vnto him, as worthy to be condemned in all. We both remit our selues vnto our former Reckoning about this point.

See aboue.

S E C T.

SECT. XIII.

The thirteenth Charge.

63. IT concerneth the testimony of *Otto Frisingensis* against *Gregory* the seuenth,

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reck. c. 5. p. 367.

WHich was alleaged quite contrary to the wordes and meaning of the Authour *Frisingensis*, so that he was enforced to lay the fault partly vpon Doctor *Tolosanus*, partly to abuse the testimony of *Claudius Espenceus*, and to make him say and auerre that which he doth not, but relateth out of others. And in no one imputation hitherto was he more grauelled then in this, as the Reader may see by turning vnto the place it selfe.

The Reuiewe.

64. I haue much cause to thanke *M. Parsons* for this so plaine dealing, in saying that *I haue not bene grauelled hitherto in any one imputation more then in this*: because hereby our Reader may more easily conceiue of *Mr. Parsons* his former *Imputations*, and thereby coniecture of them that follow, how sicke and feeble they are, by my answere vnto this: wherein I shall shew what kinde of *Gravell* *Mr. Parsons* vseth to cast in my way; for if in this point I stand not cleare, then let our Reader holde me guilty of all the other *Imputations*, wherewith *M. Parsons* hath besmeered me.

What a kinde
of Grauel
M. Parsons is.

¹See aboue, cap
12. Sect. 13.

65. The summe of the Answer, which I haue deliuered at large, is this: First that I cyted truly the testimony of *Tolosanus*, whom onely I pointed out in the marginall note, to be the Authour of that testimony, neyther hath *M. Parsons* excepted against it. Secondly, that *M. Parsons*, with fine fraude concealed my Allegation, that thereby his imputation of *falsehood* might carry the better pretence; and now since the discovery

uerie of his craft and malignancy therein, he findeth no better euasion then to say, that my marginall cytation *was not in English*, as though that would be any excuse for Mr. Parsons, who vnderstandeth Latine: Thirdly, that *Cl. Espensans* dooth expressely approue the *Epistle of the Priests of Liege*, wherein Pope Gregory the seuenth, aliàs *Hildebrand* is noted and re-proued, as being the first Pope who perturbed the Emperiall States of Christendome, by presumption of deposing the Emperour from his dignity: Lastly, that *M. Parsons* in this his new Reckoning, in saying that *Espensans* did not approue that *Epistle*, hath committed an irrecoverable vntruth, which will be vnto his conscience, as *grauell* would be to his mouth, vntill he spit it out by true repentance.

S E C T. XIIIIL

The fourteenth Charge.

65. **T**He crimination, which Mr. Parsons vrged against me was this: ^m *His wordes* (saith he) *are these: Pope Hil-* ^{m Mitig. ca 6n.}
debrand (saith our Chronographer) *was excommunicate of* ^{37. pag. 215.}
the Bishops of Italy, for that he had defamed the Apostolique
Sea with Simony, and other capitall crimes; and then cyteth
for prooofe hereof, Lambertus Schaffnaburg. Anno 1077.
As if this our Chronographer had related this as a thing of
truth, and not rather as a slanderous obiection, cast out by his
Aduersaries, that followed the part of Henry the Emperour.

The discharge.

66. My discharge was taken from the wordes of *Schaff-* ^{"Preamb. p 120}
naburgensis, which are these: *After that the same had gone* ^{Lambert^s Schaff-}
thorowout Italy, that K. Henry had set foote within the coastes, ^{naburg. hist.}
All the Bishops of Italy did flocke vnto him, congratulating his ^{Germ. An. 1077.}
^{sub fin.}

comming, becauſe he came with a reſolute courage to depoſe the Pope (to wit, Gregory 7.) Afterward he ſheweth their reaſons: That they feared not the Popes excommunication, whom all the Biſhops of Italy for juſt cauſe had excommunicated, who had by violence obſcured the Sea Apoſtolike by Symoniacall hereſie, had defiled the ſame by murders and adulteries, and other capitall crimes.

67. Thus the Biſhops of Italy (by the teſtimony of *Schaffnaburgensis*) behaved themſelues againſt *Hildebrand*, and this was the onely matter, which I propoſed as worthy of prooſe: "for as I then ſaid, ° The point now in queſtion is, whether "this Author *Lambertus Schaffnaburg*, did thinke that thoſe "Biſhops of Italy had condemned this Pope *Gregory* (for whether they did it juſtly or vniuſſly, is the ſecond queſtion) for "ſuch crimes, or no? I haue affirmed that *Schaffnaburg*, was "of this opinion: but *P. R.* denyeth it, calling my aſſertion "impudent impiety. Let vs be iudged by the euidence of the "Authour himſelfe. VVhich is a plaine conuiction of *M. Parſons* his ſlanderous dealing, who now ſtrugleth to free himſelfe from this blot, but (alas!) as a bird in the lime, to his further intanglement.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reckon. cap. 9.
pag. 376.

VV Hereunto I anſwere, that this is not the point in queſtion, whether *Lambertus* did thinke, that they had excommunicated him, or no? Neyther did we euer ioyne iſſue therevpon, as doth appeare in my charge before ſet downe: though *Lambertus* is not found any where to affirme that they did excommunicate him, but onely relateth that ſome of his enemies in their fury, rage, and paſſion did obiect ſuch things againſt him: but the true queſtion is, whether *Lambertus* ſuppoſing ſuch a thing had bene done, were of opinion, that it was juſtly or iniuſtly, rightly or wrongfully done, for otherwiſe he ſhould impertinently be brought in for the condemnation of Pope *Gregory*: for ſo much as if he had bene wrongfully and iniuriouſly ſo condemned, it would haue bene more for his praiſe, as by the examples of *S. Albanus*, *S. Chryſoſt.* and other holy men ſo condemned by multitudes of eyther bad, or deceived Biſhops, may appeare.

The

The Review.

68. Doth *M. Parsons* know what he saith? hath not a Reader liberty to iustifie any thing by the actes of men, testified by an Historian, albeit the same Historian doe in his iudgement condemne them? We reade of certaine Princes who accused *Daniel*, for transgressing the Kings commandment, in praying thrise a day vnto God; and not onely vnto King *Darius* (according as the King had inioyned;) had it not been lawfull for the godly Iewes of those times, to haue collected from the report of those Princes, concerning *Daniel*, that he was a deuout man, in praying vnto God? Would *M. Parsons*, if he had liued in those dayes, haue said that this obseruation had beene deceitfull, because the enemies of *Daniel*, who were the Reporters, disliked that acte of *Daniel*, and did therefore accuse him to the King?

His meere quarrelling.

Dan. 6.

69. *M. Parsons* himselfe is pleased sometimes to make vse of the relations of *M. Foxe*, and *Holinshead*; when they record any matter, which may serue his purpose, neuer regarding whether they that report such things do also reprove them. But of all other men, the late Romish *Apologists* are they, with whom this kind of practise is most frequent and familiar, who repeat many testimonies of Authours fauouring your cause, but out of the relation of Protestant Writers; notwithstanding the same Protestants in the same places, doe expressly reprove and refute the alleaged Testimonies. VVherefore if *M. Parsons* will make good this part of his Reckoning; then must he allow vs a new *Index Expurg.* for the cancelling of the principall arguments of their late *Catholique Apology*.

70. VVhen will *M. Parsons* vaine veme of cauelling be spent, that we may come vnto the point? which is, whether the *Bishops of Italy* did oppose themselues against *Pope Gregory the seventh*, as hath beene said; for (by your leaue *M. Parsons*) this was the issue; for the argument which I vsed in confutation of your rebellious doctrine, was taken from the authority of the *Italian Bishops* (according to the confession of

(12)

your

your Historian *Lambert Schaffnaburg*.) withstanding the Popes rebellious practise; and not vpon the opinion of the Reporter, in censuring the opposition of those Bishoppes.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reck. pag. 374.

BVt he mentioneth *All* the Bishops of Italy; the word, *All*, is fraudulently vrged by him, as you will see: so that scarcely hee dealeth sincerely in any thing:

The Reueiwe.

71. If I haue not dealt sincerely in this word *All*, then will I confesse that I haue beene guilty of *insincere* dealing in all the rest: I hope *M. Parsons* will be so good, as to acquite mee in his charge following.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reck. pag. 374.

ALbeit these wordes be in *Lambertus*, *Certatim ad eum omnes Italia Episcopi & Comites confluebant*, All Bishoppes and Earles of Italy did flocke vnto him yet that they were certaine *Italian* Bishops and Earles that dwelt about the Alpes, is euident by the narration it selfe: for the very next precedent wordes, left out by *M. Morton*, are, *Superatis asperis rupibus iam intra Italia fines consistere, certatim ad eum omnes Italia Episcopi*. After that it was vnderstood that the Emperour had ouercome the high rockes, and was within the borders of Italy, all the Italian Bishops and Earles flocked vnto him. And what sort of Bishops these were, he expoundeth within a few lines after, saying, *Qui se iampridem ab Ecclesiastica communione suspenderat*: they hated Pope Gregory, as him that had suspended them from Ecclesiasticall Communion. And a little after setting downe the clause of suspension, especially of Clergie men, to haue beene of them whom Pope Gregory had forbid marriage, to wit, some of *Lombardie* about the Alpes: and though *Lambert* call them *Italian Episcopes*, that is, the Bishops of Italy, yet doth he not meane all the Bishops of Italy.

The Review.

72. I grant that the word *All* vseth to be taken in Authors in a double signification, to wit, cyther betokening a *Generality*, that is, *All* for the most part; or an *Vniuersality*, that is, euery one

one, as euery scholler knoweth. *M. Parsons* will perswade his Reader, that I vsed and vrged the word *All* in the larger extent: now if this may be evidently prooued to be *M. Parsons* both aduerse and peruerse exception against me, I suppose our Reader hereby will discerne, that if his charity and his truth be put in true ballances, they will weigh both alike, iust nothing at all. For I was so farre from arguing from the word *All*, either vniuersally, or generally, that in reasoning from that testimony I left out the word, *All*, and said indefinitely, *The Bishops of Italy*. And this *M. Parsons* himselfe was not ignorant off, who reporteth my wordes in his *Mitigation*, thus, *P Gregory was excommunicate by the Bishops of Italy*: And (although I could not, in repeating the testimony of *Lambert*, but sometimes vse his word, *All*.) yet in my inference and conclusion I pretermitted the word, *All*, and was contented to say, *The Bishops of Italy did excommunicate the Pope*. *Hactenus de me, nunc de re*.

M. Parsons miserable fraude and falsity.

Mitigat. p. 215.

73. The Comment which *M. Parsons* maketh vpon *Lambert*, by restraining the wordes, *All the Bishops of Italy*, vnto the Clergie men, who were married, as though *all the Bishops of Italy*, there spoken of, had beene married, is his owne fallie and fabulous figment. The case stood much alike, as if our future Historiographers, in setting downe the story of the first coming of our dread Soueraigne King *Iames* into England, should say thus: *And when that his Maiesty was arrived at Barwicke, and after approached towards Newarke vpon Trent, the Nobles of the land went to meete him for so congratulate him, and, in him, their owne ioy*. I thinke that the Reader would hold it to be a fond comment to collect hereupon, that by *Nobles of the land*, were therefore meant only the Northern Lordes, because the meeting spoken off was beyond *Trent*. I am almost weary with pursuing *M. Parsons*, he is so extravagant, but yet I may not giue him ouer, for then I know he would insult in his slanderous vaine, as followeth.

His fabulous figment.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reck. pag. 378.

Mr. Morton corrupteth the Text of Lambert, by putting in *Quia*, for, *Qui*, and saying that the Bishops of Italy did excommunicate the Pope [*Quia*] because he had defiled the Apostolike See by Simony and other crimes, (as though that had bene a cause) in stead of *Qui*, that is, who had defiled the Apostolike See.

The Review.

M. Parsons lust-
full appetite to
wrangle.

74. What a lustfull appetite hath *M. Parsons* to slander his aduersaries? For if I should say that the Iudges of England doe condemne Romish Priests [*Qui*] that is, *Who are found guilty of treason*, hath it any other sense then this; *The Iudges of England doe condemne Romish Priests*, [*Quia*] that is, *Because they are guilty of treason*? And that it is so in Lambert, I desire no other euidence then the very wordes of the Author himselfe, where he saith that the Pope expostulating the matter, said that the *Emperour and his fauourites had accused him of attayning vnto the Sea Apostolike, by Simonically heresie, and defiled his life with other crimes*. Now then whether *Simony and other crimes* were objected for a, *Quia*, and cause of excommunicating him, let any Reader iudge; and consequently whether *M. Parsons* his charge of *corruption*, proceeded not from his owne corrupt affection. Howloeuver, this I dare say, that the alteration of *Quia* was nor voluntary, but accidental, euen as contrarily it happened vnto the Latin Romish translation in *Matth. 6. v. 5. Qui amant*, for, *Quia amant*: as their owne Iesuit *Maltonate* doth confesse.

Maltonate Ies.
vpon the Text.

Mr. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reck. pag. 384.

Mr. Morton alleageth *Abbas Urspergensis* as writing that *Gregory* was an vsurper of the See; and intruded by fraude, &c. but *Urspergensis* related that such words were vttered, against Pope *Gregory*, by the enemies of the Pope, by the commaundement of *Henry* in a forme of a Councel or Synode of thirty Bishops of *Brixia*: but that *Urspergensis* did affirme any thing of it or approue the same, is not found

found, but rather the quite contrary : for in the very same place and page, he sheweth how these things were contradicted by *Anselmus* Bishop of *Lucia* then living, a man (saith he) most excellent, learned, and fearing God, &c. So *Urspergensis*.

The Reueiwe.

75. What estimate *Urspergensis* had of the Papall claime, especially ouer Kinges, *M. Parsons* his owne conscience can tell, who hath called *Urspergensis* a *Schismaticall* writer, because of his opposition against the Popes vsurped iurisdiction at that time, euen as now he likewise iudgeth these thirty Bishops to haue beene *Schismaticall*, which condemned Pope *Gregory* the seauenth for his like vsurpation. Whether therefore *Urspergensis* meant to yeeld rather vnto the Decree of those thirty Bishops, or vnto the single testimony of *Anselmus*, I remit it vnto *M. Parsons* his second consideration to iudge off, after that he hath obserued that, which followeth a little after in the same Authour *Urspergensis*, where he writeth concerning *Rodulph Duke of Burgundy* (whome Pope *Gregory* the seauenth, as *Sigebert* writeth, caused to proclaime himselfe Emperour, and to take armes against the Emperour *Henry* the fourth) that the same *Rodulph* in a battaile against the true Emperour, hauing his right hand cut off, and looking vpon it, spake vnto the Bishops who were by him, and with a sigh said; Behold my hand wherewith I plighted my faith to *Henry* my Lord; behold I leaue both the Kingdome and this present life; see you vnto it, who haue made me ascend vnto his throne, whether you haue ledde me the right way, who haue followed your admonitions. Afterwardes he telleth vs of the Emperours going to *Rome*, and of the *Romans* yeelding vnto him, and abdicating Pope *Gregory*, because he refused to appeare before the Emperour: and in the end, In a Synode at *Mentz* all the rebellious Bishops were iudged to be deposed. How will *M. Parsons* like this?

^{r Mitigat. cap. 2.}
num 46. pag. 80.

^{r Ursperg. quo}
supra.

A memorable
exaple of rea-
sonable pra-
ctise by Bi-
shops.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reck. pag. 385.

HE telleth vs that *Semerinus Binus* confesseth, that Bishops' in a Councell at *Vormes* declared *Gregory* the seauenth to be deposed; and another at *Papia* to haue excommunicated him, and another at *Brixia* to haue deposed him. How can *M. Morton* cite *Binus* contrary to his owne iudgement, who calleth these Councels *Conciliabula*, that is, factious and schismaticall conspiracies?

The Reuerſe.

His deceitfull
opposition.

Preamb. p. 121.

^u Stapleton
Doctr. princip.
lib. 13. cap. 15.
pag. 547.

76. I cited *Binus*, but not contrary to his meaning: This is *M. Parsons* deceitfulnesse: for in the margin I expressed "his meaning to the full in these wordes, *Although Binus* " (said I) *called these Councels Conciliabula*; that which was to be euicted from *Binus*, was his acknowledgment that such and so many Assemblies of Bishops (which carried the generall name of Councels) had condemned Pope *Gregory*. As for the censure of *Binus*, a late Romish Doctor of this present age, and a professed Proctor and Aduocate for that See, it ought to carry no more waight in this cause, then may the censure which Doctor ^u *Stapleton* vseth against the Councell of *Basill*, when he calleth it *Conciliabulum Schismaticum*, according vnto our Aduersaries guise of reiecting all other Councels, as oft as they conclude any thing against the pretended authority of the Pope. As for the authority of the foure Councels against Pope *Gregory*, we may be better directed by *Sigebert* and *Benna*, and other Historiographers, who liued in or about those times of *Gregory*, and iustified those Councels.



THE SECOND BOOKE OF ENCOVNTER,

against M. Parsons,

*Answering his Reckoning of olde Falshoods, which
were objected in his Booke of Mitigation:*

*and are againe by him repeated in his
sixt Chapter of his new
Reckoning.*

CHAP. I.

Containing an Answer vnto his first eight charges.

M^r. PARSONS his Reckoning.



*He sixt Chapter conteineth a Recapitulation Reckon. cap. 6.
of many manifest vntrueths, wherewith pag. 392.*

*M. Morton being charged, did willingly
pretermit to answer them in his last Re-
plie, and thereby left a suspicion that he
could not answer them.*

The Review.

SECT. I.



*Suspicious men are malicious, if the Pro-
uerbe say true, which M. Parsons (I
feare) doth now verifie, who knowing
that I was in hand with an' other booke, ^{a The Prote.}
which was of greater moment than are ^{flants Apolo-}
all his libellious Treatises, if they were ^{gie for &c.}*

Aa

bundelled

bundelled vp in one, doth notwithstanding importune mee to turne, as it were, a porch into a palace, and make a *Preamble* a full *Encounter*: yet a word more of the *Preamble*.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reckon p. 392

In his Preamble, he hath chosen out both the fewest Accusations, and the weakest of all the rest, although hee professed to single out such as were most vehemently pressed and urged: I thought good therefore to set downe other vntruths laied against him in my Treatise (of Mitigation) which hee hath concealed. Let vs run ouer them, if you please.

The Review.

M. Parsons
beginneth
this second
part of his
Reckoning
with a laudible
falshood.

2 With a good will, *Maister Parsons*, but first I would trie whether I did single out the *Weakest* accusations, and such as were not so *vehemently* pressed. A brieft Recapitulation would make a cleare Reckoning for the accusations which you then vrge, although falsly, yet fiercely thus. In the first, *This is (said you) a malicious lie of a lost conscience*. In the second, thus: *Is not this perfidious dealing, and open treachery?* In the third, *He hath no conscience at all in censuring*. In the rest we heare of nothing but of *Egregious abusing of testimonies: of Many frauds in one quotation: of Many false trickes of a craftie Minister, of Rare singularity, and the like* scarce euer obserued in corrupting a text of Scripture: of a manifest lie and consenage: and of *Where is his syncerity in Christ Iesus: of foolish treachery*. In the eleuenth; *How can the malicious lying Minister expect to be trusted hereafter*. In the next, *Consider how falsly and calumniously this Make-bate doth reason*. In the thirteenth, *Can any thing be more fraudulently alleaged*. In the last, *It is a fraud and impudency, or rather impudent impietie; will euer any Reader credit him hereafter?* These and other such like Emblemes and flowers of *M. Parsons* his Rheterique may giue our Reader a sent and sense of his extream *Vehemency*, which is strong & ranck, & proue that I singled not out his weakest Obiections, as hee falsly

fallly pretendeth, and as the sequel of this discourse will make more manifest.

SECT. II.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning and summe of his first charge.

For prooffe that heresie may be without obstinacy, he citeth in *Recken. cap. 6. pag. 393.* his margent Vasquez the Iesuit, whose words are, *Malitia huius peccati in intellectu, non in voluntate perficitur, that is, The malice of the sinne of heresie is perfected in the understanding. Which our Minister understanding not, hath fondly slandered the learned man Vasquez, by making him patronize his absurd doctrine, whereas Vasquez doth expressly establish the contrary, defining heresie to bee an error in faith with obstinacie.*

The Review.

3 I^d alleaged nothing out of *Vasquez*, but his owne sentence, viz. *Malitia. &c. Heresie is consummated and perfected in the understanding*; and knowing that the formall perfection of euery thing giveth the Denomination vnto the subiect, I did inferre not as his (for this indeed had beene an iniury) but as mine owne consequence, viz. that we may conclude of *Heresie*, as it is an error in the minde, without respect of *Obstinacie*, which is a perversnesse in the will. Which libertie of arguing, from an Aduersaries proposition, against his conclusion, is granted vnto any, by the law of all schooles, especially whensoever the proposition, and conclusion may seeme to be repugnant. As for example * *Bellarmino*, in defence of *Transubstantiation*, saith that the couterfion of the bread into the bodie of Christ, is not wrought by production of the bodie of Christ out of the bread, but by Addition of the bodie vnto the bread: Some Romish Authours apprehending this position of *Addition*, did plainly conclude against *Bellarmino* his conclusion, saying that so it shall not

Foll Satif. part. 1. pag. 3. M. Parsons fraud.

* *Bellar. Recog. operum. pa. 31.*

be a *Transubstantiation*, but a *Translocation*. Playing vpon his Antecedent by their owne consequence. Thus much for my conscience.

4 Concerning the cause I haue no way offended, but in distinguishing of *Heresie*, in respect of a double Court, *Poli & fori*, that is, of Inward before God, and outward in respect of the Church. And the whole controuersie then betweene vs being about the outward apparence of an *Hereticke*, I hold, in that respect, *Obstinacy* to bee the proper tie of an Heretike; which is, for the cause it selfe, as much as any Romanist would require. If therefore this first point haue in it (as *M. Parsons* saith) *more difficultie than many others, layd together*; then may we prognosticate that *M. Parsons* will be in others manifoldly absurd; for in this first he seeketh nothing but a knot in a rush.

SECT. III.

The summe of *M. PARSONS* second charge
in Reckoning.

Reckon. p. 398. **T**O make vs odious by seuer censuring of heretikes, he bringeth out of *Azorius* this sentence: If a man doubt of his faith willingly, he is certainly an heretike: but by our Ministers leaue *Azor* addeth more, He that doubteth willingly, and pertinaciter, that is, obstinately, he is thereby an heretike. So we see the most substantiall word [obstinately] to be craftily conueyed away, &c.

The Reuiew,

5 *M. Parsons* knoweth right well that I needed not to omit this word, *pertinaciter*, to make his Professors odious, who multiplied other farre more odious positions than this, such as were the accounting of euery one an *obstinat* heretike, that maineineth any thing contrary to the Church of Rome: together with their *Bulla* cerna vpon Maundie-Thursday, cursing and excommunicating all heretikes (among whom they

they reckon Protestants) ioynely with all their *Favorites* or *His inordi-*
Commenders of their behaviors, which, for the odiousnesse of *nate iangling*
 them, he cunningly pretermitted, and yet noteth me of *craft*, *about words*,
 for the omission of *pertinaciter*. As though the defending of
 an vntueth wittingly and willingly did not emphatically
 enough implice that it was done *obstinately*, according to the
 saying of our Sauour Christ, in condemning the obstinacie
 of the Iewes, notwithstanding he did say no more but *How*
oft would I haue gathered you, &c. but you would not? Finally,
 because I am willing to satisfie *M. Parsons* to the full, if he be
 offended for want of *pertinaciter*, let him put in his Recken-
 ing *pertinacissime*, if he will, it shall not displease me.

SECT. IV.

The summe of the third charge of M. PARSONS
 Reckoning.

THe case was, whether a man comming from Couentrie, *Reckon. pa. 399.*
 which is held to be infected with the plague, which the man
 himselfe dwelling in a part of the citie, which is not infected, and
 is asked at the gate of London, whether he came from Couentrie,
 the Keeper intending to aske him concerning a place infected,
 whether he may answer No? The Questioner saith he may, *M.*
Mortou saith No, and citeth *Azorius*, as though he had said of
 this case, *Nihil tam falsum, &c.* Where he saith that we may
 not feine words of our selues in an oath without circumstances,
 &c. But *Azorius* in his third Rule, speaking of this case of a
 place thought to be infected, and is not, resoluethe that such an
 answer is lawfull.

The Review.

6 *M. Parsons* can not denie, but after that *Azorius* had
 propounded diuers obiections concerning Equiuocating
 clauses, whereof that of this Case was one, he doth applie
 vnto them two kinde of answers. The first is a generall, in
 the words that I did allege, *Nihil tam falsum, &c.* telling vs
 that

The odds between M. Parsons and Azorius concerning Equiuocation.

that *We may not feine*, &c. Wherein I then insisted, and so much the rather, because I saw there is the foundation of *M. Parsons* Defence of Equiuocation overthrowen, where *Azorius* calleth it a lie for a man, when he is demanded whether he haue any money, and hauing it shall answer, *I haue it not*, reseruing in his minde, to give it vnto you; which kinde of Equiuocation *M. Parsons* holdeth for a truth, as you haue heard. But let vs take the Resolution of *Azorius*, as it is deliuered in his *third Rule*, and his reason of the approbation of that case, doth confute *M. Parsons* ground of Equiuocating: for *Azor* restraineth a mans speech vnto the vse of words which are ambiguous in a sense; which the words themselves will beare. But *M. Parsons* alloweth such a speech of words, which haue no ambiguity in themselves, but according to that sense, whatsoener is be, that the speaker shall conceiue in his minde, so that by mixtion it may make a true proposition: as for example, *I haue no money*, meaning, to lend it vnto you, which *Azorius*, as I haue often said, condemneth for a lie.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reckn. p. 402. The sentence, which he allegeth truly in the margin, [*si ab aliquo loco peste minime infecto*, &c.] This he translateth falsly into English thus: [*If he come from a place which is infected*,] which altereth the whole case.

The Reuiew.

His extreme captiousnes.

7 I durst almost sweare that *M. Parsons* is not perswaded that I either would, or did falsifie in this place, for the English being this: *Azor* answering. (concerning the place infected with the plague) said, &c. which thus spoken, by the way of parenthesis, could not be false, because, as the case was propounded, the place was called infected, v^z. according to the opinion of the Demander: and it was also called not infected, in the iudgement of the speaker, and therefore by either of them might haue been indifferently vsed, especially

cially by the way of *parenthesis*. And that I would not so far tranſgreſſe, the *Margent* may beare me witneſſe, where in *Azorius* owne expreſſe words are ſet downe.

8 But ſuch and ſo great good will *M. Parsons* doth beareme, that he had rather produce me for a *faſſificator*, than acknowledge the truth of the thing, or (if it had been an error) to iudge it an eſcape of the pen, or of the print. Therefore am I vrged to preſent him with a number of confeſſed eſcapes of *Bellarmino*, which abound in his ſentences, in the particule *NON* is euen by omiſſions of that kinde, againſt which *Maister Parsons* now doth ſo lauiſhly inueigh. As for example, ⁴ *In* whom there are two perſons (ſaith *Bellarmino*) in ſtead of *NON*. ⁴ *He* that is, *There* are not two perſons. And ⁴ *To* haue doubted, in ſtead of, *NOT* doubted. ⁴ *To* ſignifie *Continencie*, in ſtead of, *NOT* to ſignifie *Continency*. And ⁴ *Twice*, for, *NOT* *Twice*. ⁴ *The* wall, in ſtead of, *NOT* the wall. And, ⁴ *It* ſhall bee perpetuall, in ſtead of, *It* ſhall *NOT* be perpetuall. And, ⁴ *Let* it be reiecteſt, in ſtead of, *Let* it *NOT* be reiecteſt. And ⁴ *They* might haue obiede, in ſtead of, *They* might *NOT* haue obiede. And, ⁴ *If* our hearts ſhall condemne vs, in ſtead of, *If* it ſhall *NOT* condemne vs: And (not to labour vpon trifles) many ſuch like erroneous omiſſions of the Negative *NON*. Which ſcene, I doubt not but *M. Parsons* will now play *Ployden*, and grant that ſuch errors may accidentally happen without *faſſifying* and *ingling*.

Escapes in Bellarmine's books, where, in the particule *NON* is wanting.

⁴ *Bellar. Recog.* laſtly printed, pag. 127.

⁴ *Pag.* 144.

⁴ *Pag.* 153.

⁴ *Pag.* 159.

⁴ *Pag.* 162.

⁴ *Pag.* 178.

⁴ *Pag.* 185.

⁴ *Pag.* 186.

⁴ *Pag.* 188.

SECT. V.

The ſumme of *M. PARSONS* his fourth charge.

HE would prone out of *Azorius* that *Equiuocating* in an *Recken.* p. 403
is perinurie, when as *Azorius* putteth downe many ex-
amples, wherein the ſwearer may take an oth in his owne ſenſe,
though falſe in the ſenſe of him that exalteſt the oth.

The Review.

9 The diuerſe examples, which you name, haue beene already diſcuſſed, but there is one example, which proueth
Maister

M. Parsons his description of *Equiuocating* a flat lie, and
 * See above, lib. consequently periurie in an oth * *One may in equiuocating*
 1. c. 4. (said *M. Parsons*) *reserve in his minde what is pleaseth him,*
so that the clause reserved do agree with his minde. If this be
 true, then may this *Equiuocation* goe for currant, viz. *I haue*
no money (reseruing in my minde, although I know that I
 haue money) *to giue it,* for it agreeth with the minde; and is
 * See above, 1b: notwithstanding condemned by * *Azorius* for a perfect lie.
 Therefore wheresoeuer the outward words doe not carrie
 that ambiguity of sense, wherein they are vsed (for of this
 kinde onely we do dispute) it is, in *Azorius* his iudgement,
 to be reckoned for a lie. Yea, and so must the examples of
Azorius be also, if they doe not accord with his owne Rule.
 It might therefore haue become *M. Parsons* to haue spared
 his bitter Inuective against me, vntill hee haue first reconciled
 himselfe with *Azorius*.

SECT. VI.

M. PARSONS his fift charge. The summe
 of his Reckoning.

Rechen. pa. 407.

His next falsehood is, in that he would prooue out of Tollet,
 that affected ignorance doth not excuse one, but doth rather
 argue him to be an heretike. Now all that be learned know
 that affected ignorance is the most culpable; but Tollet saith
 that Ignorantia crassa &c, that is, Grosse ignorance doth not
 excuse a man from heresie, which is different from affected igno-
 rance: for the crassy ignorant is when one careth not to be infor-
 med, but affected ignorance is when one doth purposely lie to be
 informed. So that besides his impertinencie, here is discovered
 his impudencie. This was then my conuiction against him, and
 was not this worthy of some consideration in his Answer?

The Review.

His folly. 10 Yes verily; for it is worthy a double consideration,
 the one is, to note heerein *M. Parsons* his follie, and the next
 his

his malice. The first, that he who hath so often bewrayed his owne grosse ignorance, both in ordinarie Grammar learning and in Logike, even then, when he made most ostentation of his skill: should now note it for a point of *impudencie* to faile in distinguishing such subtleties of their schoole, as are, *Not to care to informe a mans selfe*, and, *To flie to be informed*.

II But that he should *stampe* vpon this also the title of *His malice*, it argueth that he doth looke vpon his Aduersaries writings with an *oculus nequam*: for if any will aske *M. Parsons*, whether *Affected*, or, *Grosse ignorance* be worse; he will answer (as he hath done) that the *Affected ignorance* is *most culpable*. Now then, in as much as I sayd not that the Romanists meant to draw Protestants into the sentence and condemnation of *Heresie*, and consequently into their extreme *Censures*, and vengeance against them for *Grosse ignorance*, which is the lesse fault, but for *Affected ignorance*, which *M. Parsons* calleth *The most culpable* (albeit the word, *Grosse* as he sheweth did allow me to aggravate their malice against vs) with what minde could he call this difference a *falsehood*, whereof the matter it selfe freeth me so cleerely? For as I haue been but too fauourable to our Aduersaries, in lessening their malice, so haue I not been vnfaithfull to the cause, for *M. Parsons* will not denie this to be their doctrine, that *Affected ignorance* in matters of faith doth argue a man to be an heretike. Thus much for his *Grosse* wrangling. From *Card. Toller* he proceedeth vnto *Card. Bellarmine*, and doth obiect *Barclay* by the way. I will first take this rubbe out of the way.

SECT. VII.

The sixt charge about the authoritie of calling
Councels.

M. PARSONS Reckoning.

L Et any man reade the booke and chap. of Barclay, and be Reckon. ps. 410.
will wounder at the impudencie of this vaunter: for he spea-
keth

Barkl. lib. 6. ad.
uers. Monarch.
c. 26.

keeth no one word of gathering Councils, or comparison of spiri-
tual authoritie between the Pope and Emperour, concerning
their gathering of Councils or Synods, but of a quite different
subiect, of taking armes by subiects against their lawfull temporall
Princes. And what will our Minister then answer to this mani-
fest calumnation so apparently conuincd out of Doctor Barkley.

The Review.

M. Parsons
his profane
fraud.

12 The Minister will answer, that *M. Parsons* was scarce
sober, when he called either my allegation a calumnation, or
his answer a conviction: for in that place (of *Full Satisfaction*,
part. 3, chap. 10. pag. 27.) I did not produce the testimonie
of *Barkley* for the point of *Gathering of Councils*, but for the
generall matter of *Temporall subiection* due vnto Emperours
by all persons. Which Argument *Barkley* prosecute at
large in the place alleged, being lib. 6. cap. 26. pag. 521. con-
futing the common answer, which is vsed by the Roman-
ists, which is this; that *Although Christ, and Iohn Baptist,*
and other Apostles did not teach that wicked Kings ought to be
remoued in the first plantation of the Church among Infidels, yet
afterwards this was the doctrine, when Kings should become
nourishing Fathers. Their owne *Barkley* in the sentence which
was alleged confuteth that thus: *This ought to be vnto vs*
(saith he) a weightie argument to know that neither any of the
holy Fathers, or any orthodoxall Writer, for the space of a full
thousand yeeres and more (although the Church did abound with
troups of armed souldiers, and the number of tyrants was great)
is red to haue taught any such thing either in word or writing.
Adding, concerning the times of Emperours, which profes-
sed Christ, although heretically: *Why did not then those ex-*
cellent Pastors and Fathers excite the people against Valens, Va-
lentinian the younger, Heraclius, and other wicked Princes?

13 Who yet againe in his late booke, *Depositate Pon-*
tificis, writing professedly against *Bellarmino* (by whom the
Pope is held to haue a supreme power Indirectly in tempor-
all causes) doth cap. 34. argue thus: *The Pope hath not now*
greater

greater power over temporall Princes than he had before he was a temporall Prince: but before he was a temporall Prince he had no temporall authoritie any way over Kings, therefore now he hath no such power any way over them. This Confession of their Barkley must needs choake the Romish vsurpation. By which my Reader may obserue the impotencie (I forbear to quit him with his owne word of *impudencie*) of this calumnation, and his notable falshood, in dissembling the opinion of Barkley. Now we cometo Card. Bellarmine.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

He useth heere a farre greater immodestie, or rather perfidie, Reck. pag. 413. in mine opinion.

The Review.

14 These are fearefull termes: Will you stand to them? Let vs then trie your exceptions which concerne first words, and then matter; but first let vs examine the materials, the summe whereof followeth.

The summe of M. PARSONS Reckoning.

The drift of Bellarmine is wholly against M. Mortons assertion, for that he denieth that euen the Emperour had any spirituall authority for calling of Councils, but onely that they could not well in those dayes be made without them, and that for fouresenerall causes. The first: because the old Imperiall lawes made by the Gentiles were then in use, whereby all great meetings of people were forbidden, for feare of sedition; except by the Emperours knowledge and licence. The second, because the Emperours being then Lords of the whole world, the Councils could not be made in any city, without their leave. The third, for that the Councils being made in those dayes by publike charges and contributions of cities, and especially of Christian Emperours themselves, it was necessarie to haue their consent and approba-

tion in so publike an action. And the fourth and last cause, for that in those dayes, albeit the Bishop of Rome were head in spiritual matters over the Emperours themselves, yet in temporall affaires he did subiect himselfe vnto them, as hauing no temporall state of his owne, and therefore acknowledging them to be temporall Lords, he did make supplication vnto them, to command Synods to be gathered by their authoritie and licence. But since those times (saith Bellarmine) Omnes istę causę mutata sunt, All those causes were changed, The Pope himselfe being now a temporall Lord also, as other Kings and Princes are, which was brought to passe (saith he) by Gods providence, that he might haue more freedome and libertie to exercise his Pastorship.

The Reniew.

15 This relation of *M. Parsons* is very true, and my drift was only to shew how that Popes were anciently subiect in temporall matters, which is *Bellarmin*s flat assertion: where-in then haue I abused his meaning?

M. PARSONS Reckoning.

Recken. ibid.

Let vs consider the varietie of sleights and shifts, which this our Minister hath vsed, first hauing said that generall Councels were not gathered without the Emperours cost, he addeth presently of his owne [and with their consent,] which is not in the Latine.

The Reniew.

*M Parsons
grosse falsehood.*

*Bellar. lib. 1.
de Cons. c. 13.
§. Habemus
ergo.*

16 I will not trouble *M. Parsons* his patience with any quittance of like language, although I am often prouoked therunto by his rigid and vnconscionable taxations, where-of this must needs be one. For the Latine words of *Bellarmin* are these: *Non poterant aliquid facere iunior Imperatores, that is, They (viz. the Popes) could doe nothing without the Emperours consent.* Yet this deuout olde man feareth not to say

say that I added these words of mine owne, albeit he himselfe confesseth the necessitie that then was to haue the Emperours consent. This is my kinde Reckoner. But let him proceed.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Then he cutteth off the cause of the Popes subiecting themselves in those daies touching the temporality, which was, because they had no temporall state of their owne.

Reckon. ibid.

The Review.

17 I alwaies thought it lawfull for mee to make vse of an Aduerfaries confessed conclusion, such as this is (Popes were Plaine iang- formerly subiect unto Emperours) without the expressing of ling about his causes, especially seeing that the causes (whatsoever words, they were) are likewise confessed to haue bene since changed. Was little David to blame for cutting off Goliath his head, with Goliaths his owne sword, because he did not first tell what metall was in it, and who was the maker thereof? Ridiculous. And as fond is his next exception.

M. PARSONS Reckoning.

Bellarmino said that Popes made supplication to the Emperors, to command Synods to be gathered, which T. M. translateth that they [would gather] Synods, as though Bellarmine did affirme that Emperors had right to doe it.

Reckon. ibid.

The Review.

18 As though Emperors may not bee said to doe that, which they commanded to be done: Iosiah commanded the Tribes of Israel to be assembled, and yet it is written that He assembled the Tribes of Israel. Or as though the Emperors had not right to doe that which the Pope did by Supplication.

Ios. 24. 1.

M. Parsons
manifest ab-
surdities.

The power of *lication* intreat him to doe. This were to reach the Pope gathering of a boxe on the eare. Or as though *Bellarmino* did absolutely denie that Emperors had any right to gather Councils,

Tortus aliis who saith that it cannot be denied but that *In Concilijs generalibus indicendis*, &c. that is, That the Emperor had some authority in appointing of generall Councils, and that sometimes They were gathered by Emperors. Or as though *Bellarmino* (in denying that the Emperours had chiefe power heerein) might not be confuted by a Doctor of the same chaire,

Card. Cusanus confessing in expresse tearmes that The first eight generall Councils were gathered by Emperors; but the *Concord: Cath. lib. 2. cap. 25.* Bishop of Rome (like as did other Patriarks) received the sacred command to wit of the Emperors) to come unto the Synods. Thus doth *M. Parsons* his impotent calumnation vanish into a fancie which (if he should spee in an other) hee would call a phrensie.

M. PARSONS Reckoning.

Recken. pag.
414.

Then where *Bellarmino* saith, *Omnes istæ causæ &c.* All these causes were changed, he fraudulently cut off the particle, *istæ, These* which includeth a reference unto these foure causes, as though all causes and matters were now changed.

The Review.

M. Parsons
his carping
veine.

19 If I would be as captious as *M. Parsons* vseth to be, I could tell him he must goe to the schoole againe to learne to English *Iste*: which signifieth *Those* and not *These*: but I will not imitate him in trifling. To the matter: There were but foure causes which *Bellarmino* did, or could note for the Change of the Popes Subjection, and euery one of *Those*, hee saith, were changed; doth he not therefore say that *All causes were changed*? If *M. Parsons* shall say that his horse is lame of his foure feete, and heare some by-stander confirme it, saying, that indeed his horse is lame of *All* his feet, hee would not (I suppose) thereupon call him a fraudulent fellow

A similitude.

low, seeing that *All* the feet his horse hath are but *four*, for I will not imagine that *Maister Parsons* his horse is a monster? I will now cease to insist any longer vpon these his foolish wranglings.

20 The cause standeth thus: wee see that *Popes* then anciently acknowledged *Subiection* vnto *Kings* in a maine point, which is, authority of *Commanding a Councell to be gathered*: but now (as it is confessed) the case is changed. Then *Christian Emperours* were humbly intreated to lend their helpe: now they are imperiously commanded. Then they obeyed them in *Temporal affaires*: since they challenge authority to *Depose* them, which as their *Barckley* maintaineth, is contrary vnto the disposition & the Doctrine of the *Christian Church*, both in, and long after the Times of the *Apostles*. From *Bellarmino* he holdeth it not amisse to passe to the Iesuit *Salmeron*.

A strange change in pall presumptions.

SECT. VIII.

The summe of the seuenth charge of M.

PARSONS his Reckoning.

MAister Morton will needs shake *Salmeron* by the sleewe, and shew him a trick of his art, telling vs that he allowed that the King was supreme in [spirituall] affaires and ordering Priests: citing *Salmeron* for prooffe hereof; which is notably false, for *Salmeron* proueth the quite contrarie.

The Review.

21 Heere I am constrained to shake *M. Parsons* by the sleewe, and tell him in his eare that hee hath plaied me a feate of that art, which he calleth notably false, by opposing vnto me the sentence of *Salmeron*, concerning the authority of the *Kings* of the old Testament in spirituall affaires, and againe, in spirituall matters: seeing that the title of that Question, concerning the authoritie of *Kings* ouer Priests, was in the very place now objected expressly, and noted only

M. Parsons
notable false
hood.

¶ Ful Saiffact.
part. 3. pag. 2.

to be *In civil causes*, and not in *spirituall affaires*. Is not this indeed a notable *falsehood*? But he will still be like himselfe.

M. PARSONS Reckoning.

Reckon. ibid.

Summarily thus: *Whereas Salmeron said by supposition, vbi id euenisset, If it had happened that Kings had prescribed some things vnto Priests, it had beene no maruell, for so much as the Synagogue was earthly: which supposition the Minister left out, that he might more cunningly shift and auoid it.*

The Review.

22 I will not contend with *M. Parsons* about the words, *vbi id euenisset*, to examine whether it signifie, by way of supposition, *If it had happened*; or without supposition, *Whereas it had happened*, seeing it may indifferently carrie both senses. The question is, whether *Salmeron* (whom *M. Parsons* commendeth for a learned man, who hath writ many volumes, and was one of the first tenne of the order of the *Iesuits*) did suppose onely, and not affirme that *Kings* in the old law had supreme authoritie ouer *Priests*, or no? Who can better decide this contention than *Salmeron* himselfe? First looke to the same place, and he saith in the words following;

Salmeron. Ies. Part. 3. Disp. 12 in epist. Pauli in genere. §. Sed contra.

Whether the Prince or the Priest was supreme in the law of Moles.

Salmeron. Ies. Tom. 13. Tract. 63. pag. 428. §. Sed nunc.

Itaq, cum populus &c. Seeing that the people of God doth consist of a bodie and of a soule, the carnall part in the old Testament had the chiefdome, and was so appointed for signification of spirituall things. A little after, speaking of the olde Testament; *The law* (saith hee) *is abolished*, and the subiection of *Priests vnto Kings*. These termes exceed the degree of supposition.

23 But howsoever *Salmeron* may seeme to reele, and stagger in that place, both by *Supposing*, and by affirming; by doubting, and yet by concluding, notwithstanding if *M. Parsons* had had a desire to know the resolute, & determinate iudgement of *Salmeron* in this point, hee might haue easily vnderstood this expresse sentence of *Salmeron*. *Nunc omis-*

sa. &c.

(sa. &c. Thus is, Now omitting the spirituall power (saith hee) in the law of nature, or in the law of Moses, which was lesse in the old Testament, than is the Regall and Kingly, and therefore the high Priests were subiect vnto Kings, as also among the Gentiles &c. Let M. Parsons ponder this sentence, and he shall finde that this his learned man Salmeron, one of the first tenne of M. Parsons his order, doth confute many score of Iesuits, who since haue held the contrarie; This also sheweth how absurdly ignorant M. Parsons is of the iudgement of Salmeron. I am almost tired with his verbosityes, and verball skirmishes, and therefore hauing obtained the cause, I passe ouer his canuasse of the word *Synagoga*, and the other of *populus Dei*, and proceed vnto the Materials.

M. Parsons
flatly confu-
ted by Sal-
meron.

CHAP. II.

Containing an Answer vnto other eight charges.

SECT. I.

The summe of the eight charge of M. PARSONS
his Reckoning.



U^t of Salmeron, and Carenius patched together be *Raken. pag. 410.*
maketh this Romish pretence, that the old Testa-
ment was a figure of the new in Christ, & that there-
fore the spirituall power (as Popedom) must be the
sheefe, or substance &c. and answereth, calling this rather ba-
bish Grammar, than sound Divinity; and saith that the earthly
elements were figures of the spirituall and heavenly things in the
eternall and celestially Hierusalem: Will he therefore conclude by
sound Divinity, that it was not a figure of things vpon earth,
which should be fulfilled in the new Testament? Was not *Manna*
a figure of the Eucharist, and Circumcision a signe of our Bap-
tisme? And Saint Paul. 1. Cor. 9. applieth that of *Dent. 25.*
Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the Oxe, that laboureth,
vnto Preachers maintenance of the new Testament, and 1. Cor.
10. All these things happened vnto them in figures.

C e

The

The Review.

Ceremonies
of the old law
how figures
of the new.

1. Cor. 10.

1 I answered, that some of these Instances were ceremonial, and some examples of Gods extraordinarie punishments. For the first, I denie not, but that *Circumcision*, *Manna*, and the *Rock* were types, and had analogie with the Sacraments, which are *antitypa*, and both conspire together in one *Christ*, as the *archetypon* of all, and therefore both are spirituall: for the which cause the Apostle sheweth of the Israelites that they in their Elements * *Eate the same spirituall meat, and dranke the same spirituall drinke*, meaning *Christ*; which was, as *S. Augustine* expoundeth it, *The same which we do*, namely *Christ*.

2 The second, concerning the *Oxe*, had the same morall equitie in the old law, for the maintenance of the Priests & Levites, as it hath now in the Gospell for the Preachers. And as touching the third, we may say that the diuerse miraculous iudgements of God in former time vpon *Fornicators*, *Murmurers*, and *Idolaters* in Israel, are figures vnto the after-Christian world, that if wee finde not the like visible vengeance, yet are we taught to make true consequences from them, to wit; that if we dwell securely in like sinnes, although we feele not the like outward plagues, yet wee shall be sure to bee tormented in the end, because the God, who hath beene iust visibly, will bee euerlastingly iust, to punish transgressions and sinnes.

3 In the next place hee exaggeteth this difference of translation, to wit, *The old Testament is a figure of the new in Christ*, in stead of this (as *M. Parsons* will haue it) *The earthly kingdome (of the Iewes) was a shadow of the spirituall gouernment, that was in the Church of Christ*. Both which are no more different, in effect, than *figure* and *shadow*, for *M. Parsons* confesseth that the proposition is true, that *The old Testament was a figure of the new in Christ*. The next exception is of some importance.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

There followeth in the Consequent or second proposition (that ^{Reckon. pag. 412.} therefore in the new the popedome is the substantiue) which is no lesse corruptly inferred in our name; than was the Antecedent affirmed: for that we do not inferre, nor yet the Author Carerius in the said second Prop. or Consequence by him alleaged, that forsomuch as the old Testament is a figure of the new, therefore in the new the Popes spirituall authority is the substantiue &c. For that this were a weake inference, as euery man seeth. Nay Carerius maketh no inference at all in this place by him alleaged, but only useth that similitude which before you haue heard, of the Substantiue and Adiectiue.

The Reuiew.

4 What is this? doth not Carerius make that Inference M. Parsons
M. Parsons? yea and doth he not make any inference thereof his eregions
at all? Thus you haue written, but with what conscience? vntruth.
For Carerius propounding this position, by way of obiection, viz. ^{Carerius de potestate Rem. Pons. lib. 2. in proem. & cap.} The Pope hath not, by the law of God, any temporall power, nor can he command secular Princes; a ground of which position was this, That one and the same person cannot be both a Politicke and Ecclesiasticall: this foundation he laboureth to confute by many examples of the old Testament, from the which he concludeth thus: Hinc in lege, &c. Hence (we see) that in the old law the Kingdome was the Substantiue, and the Priesthood the Adiectiue: but in the new law of the Gospell Priesthood is the Substantiue, and the kingdome is the Adiectiue. Which is brought in to prooue, that the power Politicke, as the Adiectiue, & the Power Ecclesiasticall, as the Substantiue may be both in one man. And is not this an Inference? And thereby further intimating, that as in the old the Temporall was the Substantiue, that is, the superior; so vnder the Gospell the Ecclesiasticall is the Substantiue, and superiour. And is not this That inference which I speake
Cc 2 of?

^a *Carerius lib.*
4. de potestat.
Pont. 9 p. 127.

of? And finally the speciall drift of that booke of ^a *Carerius* is nothing else but to establish a Monarchicall power of the Pope both spirituall, and temporall throughout the world.

SECT. II.

The ninth charge of M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

T Here followeth against Dolman a like sleight.

The Review.

^a *Quod lib. pa.*
152. & 288.

5 Dare Dolman yet againe shew his face? ^a Which booke M. Parsons made (saith their Priest) and is a seditious booke, most trecherously intitling the Infanta of Spaine to the English crowne. Could M. Parsons so often countenance this Troiane horse except he had meant to play the part of a Sinonickall dissembling *Misigator*? But to the point.

The summe of M. PARSONS charge.

Recken. pa. 424.

He alleaged Dolman to say, that the Commonwealth hath authority to chuse a King, and to limit him lawes at their pleasure. Which if it were truly alleaged, yet in there was no mention of people, or Democraticall state, but only of the Commonwealth, which includeth both the Nobility and people. Secondly Dolman speaketh not of chusing a forme of government, be it Democraticall or other, but speaketh (as by his words we see) of a power of a Commonwealth that is denoide of any certaine government, to chuse them what forme of government they like, with limitations they thinke most expedient.

Dolman. part. 1.
pag. 13.

The Review.

6 Vpon this his conceit he complaineth of *Falshoods* both in alleaging the words of the Author, which are not in him, and also

also in inferring from them, which the words themselves will not beare. First of the words. *Dolman* said, *The Common-wealth* hath power to chuse her government, I said, *To change her King*. If she can change her Government, may not she alter her Governour? And *Dolman* saith in the margin of the same place, that *The Common-wealth* limiteth the Governours authority. And is not a King a Governour?

M. Parsons
his childish
exceptions.

7 Concerning the sense *M. Parsons* seemeth to perswade vs that *Dolman* (that is, *M. Parsons* himselfe) did allow vnto a Common-wealth onely a power to chuse a government, and not to depose a Governour. Is he not like to bewray his ignorance in reading other mens bookes, who is thus vnskillfull in his owne? For in his *Dolman* we read, that *The Common-wealth* hath authority not onely to put backe a new Inheritor vpon lawfull considerations, but also to dispossesse them that haue bene lawfully put into possession. And againe, *The Common-wealth* (saith he) may cut off their heads, if they infect the rest. Heere *M. Parsons* plaieth the nimble Barber, and can teach people to polle the heads of Kings. It is no maruell why his owne fellow exclaimed against this booke, calling it *Trecherous*, as though he had sentenced the Authour to be woorthy to haue his head shauen for his doctrine. As for the word, *Democraticall*, which *M. Parsons* misliketh, I would but aske whether every Common-wealth were not included, where *Common-wealth* in general was expressed? After this he returneth vnto *Cicerius* his *Paduan* Doctor, whom I propounded as affirming that *The high Priest of the old Testament was Supreme in ciuill causes*.

M. Parsons
wilfull igno-
rance in his
owne books.

Dolman, lib.
1. c. 3. p. 32.

pag. 38.

Full satisf.
part. 3. pag. 2.

SECT. III.

The summe of the tenth charge, of *M. PAR-
SONS* his Reckoning.

HE maketh *Cicerius* say, that *The high Priest was Supreme in ciuill causes*, which words, *Ciuill causes*, he putteth in of his owne: for *Cicerius* hath them not either in words, or sense, but teacheth the plaine contrary in all his discourse, to wit, that

Recken. p. 426.
Lib. 2. de po-
testate Rom.
Pont. c. 18.

he meaneth, in matters belonging unto religion and Priest hood, and not of temporall Principality, or ciuill causes, as this Minister doth belie him: Neither could Carerius meane so, except he should be contrary to himselfe, and therefore that clause was per-
ficiously thrust in by the Minister, &c.

The Review.

M. Parsons
his egregi-
ous and open
falshood.

8 Except *M. Parsons* had a dispensation to traduce his Aduersary by wilfull vntruthes, I would not thinke that he could deal thus vnconscionably: the matter is, whether *Carerius* named, or meant that the Priests of the old law had a superiority ouer Kings in *Ciuill matters*. *M. Parsons* denieth it, I haue affirmed it, and shall now demonstrate it out of *Carerius*. And because *M. Parsons* calleth to witness *All the discourse of Carerius*, I shall craue so much leaue of my Reader, as to suffer me to passe from the fountaine downe the river of this discourse.

¹ *Carerius lib.*
2. de potestate
Rom. Pont.
cap. 9.

9 *Carerius* in his booke ca. 9. laieth downe this position, that ¹ *The Pope hath by diuine law most full power throughout the world, Tum in rebus Ecclesiasticis, Tum in Politicis*, that is, both in Ecclesiasticall and Ciuill things. And concludeth the Chapter in the same tearmes of Both in Ecclesiasticall and Ciuill things. And this is the expresse and direct subiect of that discourse, which he laboureth to prooue (professedly against *Bellarmino*) from Canonists, from Decrees of Popes, from Reasons, vntill he come to the 13. chap. concluding therein, as before, that *The Pope hath power ouer the whole world in*

¹ *Carerius lib. 2.*
cap. 18.

Ecclesiasticall and Ciuill matters. He pursueth the same point vnto the 18. chap. wherein we now insist, where he seeketh to remooue an Obiection, which was made against his former conclusion of the Popes authority in Ecclesiasticall and Ciuill matters. The obiection is this ¹ *The Kings of Iudah did depose the Priests, Ergo, The Emperour may depose the Pope.* Marke now (good Reader) the answers of *Carerius*. His first is, that *In the old Testament the iurisdiction Ecclesiasticall and Ciuill were both one, and was gouerned by the King,*
who

¹ *Id. num. 13.*

who had power ouer Priests to put them to death. This, you will say, is contrary to my assertion; it is true, I confesse it: but now heare his last answer in the same Chapter. There (as though he would recant the former, and be contrary to himselfe) he thus affirmeth. *I say (saith he) that euen in the old Testament the high Priest was about the King, which I proue out of Num. 27, where it is sayd that at the word of the high Priest Iosuah the Prince and all the people was to go in and out.* The obiection being concerning both Ecclesiasticall and Ciuill power of the high Priest, and that the King might put him to death (a ciuill censure): The answer being of the Princes and peoples going in and out (ciuill acts): and the whole scope being about Ecclesiasticall and ciuill matters, M. Parsons must, to his owne shame, necessarily acknowledge that I haue not been contrary vnto *Carerius*, but *Carerius* hath been contrary to himselfe. To this *Paduan Doctor M. Parsons* ioyneth a *Dominican*.

SECT. IV.

The summe of the eleuenth charge of M. PARSONS
his Reckoning.

Victoria (saith M. Morton) saith that Priests, besides that *Reckon. pa. 418.* they are Ministers of the Church, they are likewise members of the Common-wealth, and a King is aswell a King of the Clergie, as of the Laitie, therefore the Clergie is subiect in temporal things, for such a matter is not ruled by any power spiritual. A plaine demonstration. So be. And so I say, it is a plain demonstration, but of M. Mortons falshood and abusing the Reader, to make him beleue that *Victoria* fauoured him in this matter of the exemption of Priests, whereas in the very place heere cited *Victoria* saith that *Ecclesiastici iure exempti sunt*, that is, Ecclesiasticall men are by law exempted and freed from the ciuill power, so as they may not be commented before a secular Iudge either in criminall, or ciuill causes.

The Review.

10 I haue called my prooffe, taken out of *Victoria*, a plaine demonstration.

M. Parsons
his grosse
slander.

1 *Victor. Relect.*
1. § 7. Prop. 4.

The exem-
ption of
Priests.

= *Defensio*
Marfilij ad-
uers. Bellar.
2. 3. §. Pri-
ma prop.
= *Ibidem*, §.
Pro tutela.

demonstration, to confute the now pretended Romish exemption of Priests, which *M. Parsons* calleth a plaine demonstration of my falsehood, as though I had abused the sentence and sense of *Victoria*: wherein if *M. Parsons* haue dealt iustly, then thinke (good Reader) that he can not doe me an iniurie. I shall easily acquit my selfe both by the euidence of the place of *Victoria*, and by the confession of their owne Doctour, in his like exposition of *Victoria*. First, the text standeth thus: '*The persons of Clergie-men* (saith *Victoria*) *are not altogether; nor in all things exempted from the ciuill power, neither by humane, nor by diuine lawes.* And after, in the Prop. 8. *If the libertie of Clergie-men* (saith he) *were to the manifest destruction of a Common-wealth, so that Ecclesiasticall persons should riotously worke the slaughter of Laicks, and the Pope would not remedie it, then secular Princes might provide for the good of their Laicks, notwithstanding the privilege of the Clergie.*

11 This is so contrary vnto the claime that the now Pope hath made of a power to exempt Ecclesiasticall persons, notwithstanding the contrarie opposition of Magistrates, that their owne Doctour (in his * confutation of *Bellarmino* about this point) doth produce the iudgement of many scholasticall writers, as * namely, *Medina, Conarrubias, Sotus, Victoria*; vnto whom (which is our second point) he adioineth himselfe; who, although he say it is lawfull to exempt the Clergie; yet doeth he not defend an absolute necessity. And thus the Argument proueth to be a *Demonstration* of *M. Parsons* his ignorance. Another *Demonstration* of his idlenesse hee will giue himselfe in his next Addition: the summe whereof followeth.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reckon. p. 429.

We shall further finde so many manifest corruptions, intermissions, and geldings, as is a shame to behold: for whereas Victoria saith that Clergie-men aliquo modo subiiciuntur Regi, that is, in some sort are subiect to the King, he leaues out these

these words, In some sort : And instead of saying that Clergie-men, for so much as appertaineth unto temporall affaires, are not governed by Ecclesiasticall power, he saith : that the Clergie is subiect to civill authoritie in temporall things, for such matter is not ruled by any spirituall power : whereby hee would haue his Reader to imagine, that no spirituall power may haue authoritie to gouerne temporall matters.

The Review.

12 I did effectually enough translate the words, *In some sort*, when I expressed the sort to be *In temporall things*, and not in spirituall. In the second place, if the other two translations be compared, I thinke the Reader shall finde that as much may be collected out of *M. Parsons* his translation as out of mine; which maketh me partly to take vp the Orators complaint, who was affraid to deliuer an Oration to the vulgar people, *Because* (saith he) *they will not vnderstand the meanings*; or to the learned, *for they will vnderstand more than is meant*. I may reckon *M. Parsons* among the learned sort, for sure I am that I intended not any such perswasion. From priuate Doctours he thinketh good to passe vnto an Archbishop and Martyr, *Boniface*.

His veine of contentuou-
ness.

SECT. V.

The summe of the twelfth charge of *M. PARSONS* his Reckoning.

THe Canon, as it is alleged by *M. Morton*, is this, [Though Recken. pa. 432.
a Pope should carrie many people with him into hell, no man may presume to say, *Why do you so?*] I marvel with what conscience, or if not conscience, with what forehead at least, these men can write things, which they know, or may know to be meerly false and forged? Is not this a signe of obstinate wilfulnesse, and that neither God nor truthe is sought for by them, but only to maintaine a faction, with what sleight and falshood former.

The Reniew.

13 What is that whereof *M. Parsons* his head is so full, that he should require a fore-head in his Aduersaries? Heere is a *Parturiunt montes*, we shall see many ridiculous misfe by and by. The first followeth.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Recken.
pag. 432.

M. Morton citeth the Canon of *Gratian*, Si Papa, in the name of Pope Boniface, in stead of Boniface a Martyr, who was neuer Pope, but a vertuous learned Englishman, who lived 850. yeares agoe, and was Arch-Bishop of Mentz in Germany. Which escape, besides the ignorance, tasteth also of much profane malice and impiety.

The Reniew.

* Epist. Tava.
con. De emend.
Grat. Dial. 1.
pag. 5.

The Martyrs
haue beene
men of im-
perfection.

* Bellar. l. 1.
de beat. Sanct.
c. 5. §. His
adde.

14 Can there be any thing spoken in preiudice of any Pope, which will not prooue vnsauoury in *M. Parsons* his palate? If I haue erred in mistaking the Inscription of *Gratian*, you might the more easily pardon me, knowing that *Gratian* himselfe is charged by your owne * Bishop for applying false inscriptions to the testimonies which he alleageth. But let vs take him for that *Boniface* the Martyr, and not *Boniface* the Pope, yet hath this Canon beene alwaies allowed by many Popes: and what difference of iudgement can there be in an Author, and in an authorizer of any worke? Neither may any hold it an *Impiety*, to except against the saying of some Martyrs, for diuers Martyrs haue not beene without the tincture of some errours, otherwise *S. Cyprian* should not haue held vntill this day the title of a Saint. *Victorinus* erred in the question concerning the state of soules, and is therefore taxed by *Cardinall Bellarmine*, who saith that *Victorinus* was a Martyr, yet (as *S. Hierom* saith) he wanted learning. How will this answer of *S. Hierom*, and *Cardinall Bellarmine* relish

relish with *M. Parsons*: must both these also be noted of *Impietie*? See the next.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

The Summe. He sheweth from the Canon, that the Pope is *Reckonibid.* not to be reprehended, &c. but concealeth that the same Canon pronounceth damnation vpon such a negligent Pope: and that such a one is to suffer eternall punishments.

The Review.

15 I was onely to prooue what prerogatiue was ascribed vnto the Pope in this life which was, *Non indicandus, nisi à fide deuus*: it concerned me not to tell that a wicked Pope must be iudged and condemned after this life, whereof none can doubt, but an Atheist. Yet more.

M. PARSONS Reckoning.

In repeating the Canon thus: [*No mortall man shall, or may Reckonibid.* presume to reprehend him] there be endeth in which short phrase there are many fraudes; for first he leaneth out, if sic, heere in this life: then presumeth, doth presume, he translateth, may presume: and lastly he leaneth out the reason, because the Pope is not to be iudged.

The Review.

16 That is to say, I would not imitate *M. Parsons* in idle *M. Parsons* and impertinent superfluities: for he that saith, *No mortall* many idle *im-* man may presume to reprehend a Pope, must needs vnderstand perunences. in this life, except *M. Parsons* haue some diuine power and commission to send a *Mortall man* (for in heaven there is not any reprehensible) to reprehend some Pope in hell. Thus much of the first fraud.

17 The second is as childish: for the sentence is, as *M. Parsons* calleth it, a Canon; and the propertie of a Canon is

directory, prescribing what may, or may not be done; and the next words explaine the meaning, *The Pope must not be iudged*. This sheweth *M. Parsons* his follie. The third is yet more frivolous, for the assertion being nought, the reason cannot be good, which is this: *The Pope cannot be iudged*, which conclusion hath been condemned by their counsell of *Constance*, and of *Basil*, both which held that *Popes* are subiect vnto the iudgement of a *Councell* even for maners. These former exceptions, were but little myse: now the great one leapeth out.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning, summarily.

Recken. pag.
435.

But the greatest corruption, which most importeth the simple Reader, is this; that he translateth the former sentence thus: Though hee should carrie many people into hell, yet no mortall creature may presume to say, Why doe you so? But in the Latine, neither in the Canon it selfe is there any such interrogation at all, as why doe you so? And therefore I may aske T. M. why doe you lie so? Or why doe you corrupt your Author so? Or why doe you translate in English; for the abusing of your Reader, that which neither your selfe doe set downe in your Latine text; nor in the Canon it selfe, by you cited, hath it at all? Is not this wilful and malicious fraud? Wherein when you shal answer me directly and sincerely, it shal be a great discharge of your credit with those, who in the meane space will iustly hold you for a Deceiuer. I find the same objected by Sir Francis Hastings and afterward by Mathew Sutcliffe, but I find the same confuted at large by the Warnwoord.

Pag. 432.

The Review.

M. Parsons his
wyld retorque.

18 And I must tell *M. Parsons*, that seeing the *Canon* doth not allow *Any mortall man* to reprehend a *Pope* in this life, except he deslett from the faith; consequently it will not permit a man to say, in way of reproofe, *Why do you so? As euery Barber, Baker and triuiall man knoweth; by the com-*

mon

mon phrased of speech : and therefore I may well eccho against *M. Parsons*, and say, Why doe you trifle so? Why do you riot so? Why do you rage so?

19 But it may seeme that *M. Parsons* is thus earnest, because he thinketh it would be no small staine to their Pope, if hee should bee knowne either to say, or to allow any to teach that *None may reprehend the Pope*, saying, *Why do you so*? Oh sic! this is more than euer *M. Parsons* heard of. I would therefore intreat this our great Doctor to turne his eye vnto the *Glosse* vpon the *Extraneants*, where it is said, in the behalfe of Popes dispensation, *Nec est qui audeat dicere, Domine, cur ita facis?* that is, *Neither is there any, that dare say, Why doest thou so?* Where (as though this point were worthy the sight of al passengers) there standeth in the Margent as it were a finger pointing vnto it, saying, *Let no man say to the Pope, Domine cur ita facis? My Lord, why doe you so?* Therefore must I aske you once againe, Why deale you so rashly, in writing you know not what? or, in obiecting malice in such a matter, why doe you reproach mee so maliciously?

His zeale for the Pope without knowledge.

Extraneant. de Concess. Tit. 4. cap. 2.

M. Parsons his grosse ignorance, or else peeuisish malice.

20 Furthermore, because I finde *M. Parsons* making mention of *Sir Francis Hastings*, and of his owne booke of *Warnwoord*, I must furthermore bee so sawcie as to pull him once againe by the sleeue, and aske him by way of digression whether he be northe man that denied that this salutation, [*Dominus Deus Papa*] is found in the *Glosse* of some Canonist?

SECT. VI.

M. PARSONS his Warn-woord, against *Sir Francis Hastings* his Wast-woord, concerning, *Dominus Deus Papa*.

SIR Francis Hastings saith that the Canonists say roundly *Sin the Glosse, Dominus noster Deus Papa, Our Lord God the Pope: but if it were so, why doth not Sir Francis either roundly or squarely quote vs the text? Surely it is, that I cannot*

Warn-woord, Enc. 1. cap. 2. Pag. 30. num. 10.

finde it, though I have much sought for it; and hard it is to beleeue that any such text may be found. But yet here to helpe one S. F. with some part of his credit, and for very compassion I will adde a coniecture of a friend of his, how he might chance to haue bene deceived about Dominus Deus noster Papa, if he cite it upon his owne reading, for that perhaps he might find it written thus, D. noster D. Papa, both D. D. signifying a double Dominus, which some cauilling Heretike espying, & iudging it inconuenient to repeat Dominus twice, would needs inforce the second D. to be set for Deus. This my coniecture is confirmed somewhat by the similitude of a like fond chance, whereof I haue heard as happened in the Subscription of an English letter, written from certaine Marriners to the Lord Admirall in these words: To the right honourable, our good L. the L. Admirall, which second L. a simple fellow interpreted to signify the Lady Admirall, saying that the first L. signifying the Lord himselfe, the second L. must needs signifie also his Lady. If I misse in this coniecture or comparison, S. F. is cause thereof, that cured not the text, thereby to cleare all matters, and to deliuer both vs of this doubt, and himselfe of new suspicion of imposture.

The Review.

21 I like you well, M. Parsons howsoever the matter goe, you can make your selfe mirth with your owne fancies and coniectures, as though there were no such thing as Sir Francis alleaged out of their Romish Glosses, when as yet there can be nothing more apparent, for in the *Extraneant* at the word *significasti*, Tit. 14. cap. 4. the Glosses saith plainly in the very same words, *Dominum Deum nostrum Papam*, that is, Our Lord God the Pope, euen, as it is set out by their best approoued edition of the *Extraneants*. But so it pleased M. Parsons rather to bewray his owne ignorance of the common Romish Glosses, than to lose his ieast of Lord, and Lady, although it bee but a silly one God wot: for what man could bee so simple and indeed stupid

M. Parsons
blind infol-
lency, or else
perfidious
Hypocritise.

as to thinke there could be any congruity of speech in such a superscription as he hath feigned, viz: *To the right honorable our good Lord, the Lady Admirall*; wherein, as it were, by a strange metamorphosis, the sex is changed, a *Lord*, being turned into a *Lady*? What then shall we thinke of *M. Parsons* his wit, who hath so vniustly imputed vnto *Sir Francis* a suspicion of *Imposture*? If he sported thus in dissemblance, he must be iudged to haue beene malicious; if in ignorance, hath he not beene ridiculous? I returne to our Reckoning; wherein from *Boniface* an Archbishop hee passeth to a Pope *Leo*.

SECT. VII.

The thirteenth charge, concerning the Oath of Allegence. The summe of M.

PARSONS Reckoning.

Pope Leo (*sith M. Morton*) writing vnto a true Catholike Reck. pag 436.
Emperor said, You may not be ignorant that your Prince- 437.
 ly power is giuen vnto you not onely in worldly regiment, but also in spiritual, for the preservation of the Church. As if he had said, not only in causes temporal, but also in spiritual, so far as it belongeth to the outward preservation, not to the personall administration of them; And this is the substance of our English Oath. And further neither doe our Kings of England challenge, nor subiects condescend vnto. In which words you see two things are contained: first what authority *S. Leo* the Pope aboue 1100. yeares agoe ascribed vnto *Leo* the Emperor in matters spiritual & ecclesiastical. The second, by this mans assertion, that neither our Kings of England challenge, nor doe the subiects condescend vnto any more in the Oath of supremacy, that is proposed vnto them. Which if it be so, I see no cause why all English Catholikes may not take the same in like manner, so far forth as *S. Leo* alloweth spirituall authority to the Emperour of his time. Wherefore is behooneth that the Reader stand attent to the deciding of this question: for if this be true, which here *M. Morton* anoneth our Controuersie about the Supremacy

* Recken, pag.
439.

macie is at an end. * Heerupon I urged him very earnestly, that this assertion might be maintained, saying, among other things: Meethinks such publike doctrine should not be so publike-ly printed and set forth, without publike allowance and intention to performe and make it good. If this be really meant, we may easily be accorded: if not, then will the Reader see what credit may be given to any things they publish, notwithstanding this book commeth forth with this speciall commendation, of published by authority, &c. Which words in my iudgement, should haue mooued M. Morton to leane somewhat to the matter in this his Answer, and not to haue passed it ouer so sily, as though neuer mention had beene made thereof. But euery man will guesse at the cause, and so we shall expect it at some other time.

The Review.

22 I will take no longer Time than this present, and vpon the issue heerof will I appeale vnto the Reader, to iudge according to the iust apparence of truth. That which I thenauerred hath been since published in print by one of far more exact iudgement, than that I may be worthy to say, that he hath published the same. And this passed vnder the approbation and priuelege of our gracious King, who is the *Lex loquens*, and can best interpret the sense of the Oath. * Wee yeeld (saith this reuerend Prelate) nothing to our King, which belongeth vnto Priestly function, neither doth the King affect it: he initly challengeth, and we acknowledge due vnto him those acts which appertaine vnto outward policy, for the care of religion, which is, according to the law of God, to be both keeper, and protector of the tables of the law of God, by punishing of blasphemous idolatrous, and false Prophets, in restoring religion vnto her ancient purity, governing all kinde of persons (within his Kingdom) as well Ecclesiasticall as Laicks, yea euen vnto the deposing of a Priest vpon his demerit. This is as plaine a profession, and with as good Authority, and from as worthy a pen, as the State, which made the Oath, could performe.

* The Reuerend
B. shop of Chi-
chester in
Tortura
Torti, pag. 380.

M. Parsons
his promise
chalenged.

23 What say you now, M. Parsons? Will you, as you said

said, *Accord unto this Oath* ? Then must you renounce the *Brems* of your Pope : if you will not *Accord*, then are you, Pope Leo in these offers, but wretched *Equiuocators*. And the rather, because 'Pope Leo (as your *Car. Causanus* obserueth) ^{subiect vnto the Emperor.} *submit- ted himselfe vnto all the punishments, which were contained in* ^{Card. Causanus Concord. Cathol. li. 2. c. 20.} *the lawes of the Emperor Martianus.* Vpon which consideration the same *Cardinall* made bolde to complaine of after-Popes, who haue degenerated from the humiliry of their ^{Popes degenerate.} *Ancients.* In his next exception there is nothing but ver- bality, that is, a lauish trifling about words.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

These words, Debes incunstantèr aduertere, he transla- teth, Thou may not be ignorant, he should haue Englished it thus: Reckon. pa. 437
Thou ought resolutely to consider.

The Reuiew.

24. By *M. Parsons* his Grammar, *Incunstantèr*, is, *reso- lutely*. I thinke the Boies of his Colledge will correct this, and tell him that, *Incunstantèr*, is, *without delay*. There is no reason wee should expect true Latine-Grammar of him, who faileth so absurdly euen in his English Grammar: for *Resolutely to consider* is a phrase (I thinke) which an Eng- lish eare will hardly indure. It had bene better thus, *To consider resolutely*, and yet this is absurd: for our English is, *To resolue consideratly*, and not, *To consider resolutely*; because in this the cart draweth the horse.

25 I am ashamed of these impertinencies, whereunto I am constrained by *Maister Parsons*, who delighteth so much in friuolousnesse, that ' hee reprooueth mee for trans- lating the word, *Præsidium Ecclesie*, *preseruacion of the Church*, and must haue it, forsooth, Englished, *Defence of the Church*, as though defence were not preseruacion, and prefer- *uation Defence*. It seemeth that *M. Parsons* meaneth to claime some kindred with that wise *Alynonomist*, who once said, that *Pepper is hote in operation, but cold in working*: and to shake hands with that miserable comforter, who vsed no other reason to comfort a yong scholar, that had bene

M. Parsons his ignorance both in Latin and in Eng- lish construc- tion.

Reckon. pag. 438.

M. Parsons his ridiculous exception a- gainst transla- tion.

A similitude.

E c

expulſed

expulſed out of the College, than to tell him that he was but Expulſed onely, and not expulſed.

SECT. VIII.

The fourteenth charge, in the point of *Equivocation*, out of *Sepulveda*. M. PARSONS Reckoning.

Reckon. p. 440.

BUt what ſaith this Doctor Genesius Sepulveda? He will tell you (ſaith Maſter Morton) that this ſenſe (of this text of Scripture) which you conceale is not onely contrary to the ſentence of all Fathers, but alſo againſt all common ſenſe. And is this poſſible? Will Sepulveda denie all thoſe Fathers, alleged by me before for our interpretation, to be Fathers? Will hee ſay, that their expoſition is contrary to all common ſenſe? doth not Genesius himſelfe in the very chapter here cited allege both S. Hierom, and S. Auguſtine for this interpretation, and alloweth the ſame? What ſhameleſſe dealing then is this of our Miniſter, to charge Genesius with ſuch folly or impietie, which hee neuer thought off? For Genesius denieth not either the ſenſe or interpretation of the place, and much leſſe ſaith, That it is contrary to the ſentence of the Fathers, and leaſt of all, to common ſenſe: but denieth onely the application thereof for uſe and praſtiſe to certaine caſes, wherein he admitteth not *Equivocation*. &c.

The Review.

26 The * Text of Scripture is *Marc. 13. 32. Of that day and houre knoweth no man, no not the ſonne himſelfe &c.* *Sepulveda* alloweth the interpretation which the Fathers give hereof, but not in the ſenſe which the *Equivocators* do vrge, and therefore he admoniſheth his Reader to take heed leſt that vpon this interpretation there be brought in a doctrine of *Equivocation*, which in his former chapter hee did condemne for a lie, as I * haue prooued at large. Therefore the falſhood is of M. Parſons his part, who will not diſtinguiſh the interpretation which *Sepulveda* admitteth, from that *Equivocating*

* Full ſatiſfaction part. 3. p. 75.

M. Parſons abuſe of *Sepulveda* by his falſe preſumption.

* See aboue lib. 1. c. 13. num. 5.

quiuocating sense, which he abhorreth. After this *M. Parsons* returneth to his word-bate.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Secondly he maketh Sepulveda discredit the Fathers, which Reckn. p. 441. he himselfe alleageth, Englishting ancient Fathers, for, ancient Schoolemen; and addeth, consensum, of his owne, leauing out, hominum, to make it sound common sense.

The Review.

27 If there had been in *M. Parsons* any sense of common shamefastnesse, he could not haue sayd, that I made *Sepulveda* discredit the Fathers: for *Sepulveda* said, I will retyou (Equiuocators) that the sense, which you conceit, is contrary to the sentence of Ancients. Was this to discredit the Fathers, nay was it not greatly for their credit to professe simplicitie, and to condemne your Equiuocating subletie? And such like is his next Cauill: for *Sepulveda* doth as expressely name these ancient Fathers, *Hierome, Augustine, Basil*, as well as he did the ancient Schoole Doctors.

M Parsons
willfull fall-
hood.

Sepulveda
Tract. de con-
suetudinibus, &c.
pag. 49.
His other vn-
truth.

CHAP. III.

Containing an Answer to the next five charges.

SECT. I.

The summe of the xv. charge, in the point of Equiuocation.

M. PARSONS Reckoning.



Ee quoteth *Sotus*, but all is treacherie, falsehood, *Reck. pag. 442.* and lying in this Impugner of Equiuocation, for first by subtle Doctor all vnderstand *Scotus*, and not *Sotus*.

The Review.

1 I Called your *Sotus* the *subtle Doctor*: you say that this Epithet belonged vnto *Scotus*. I haue heard that two Gentlemen, the one English, the other Scottish, met together, the one sitting on the one side of the table, and the other on the other side. And when the English man asked, *Quid interest Scotum & Sotum? What there was betwene a Scot and a Sot? The Table*, quoth the Scot. There was wit in this. But if we aske *M. Parsons* what oddes there is between their *Scotus* the Franciscan Frier, and *Sotus* the Dominican? hee will answer vs, *Subletie*. Is not this a great piece of learning for *M. Parsons* to vaunt of? And yet, if we may beleue *Sotus*, euen *Scotus* also will condemne your manner of Equiuocating for a lie.

A Similitude.

His vaine
vaunt.M. PARSONS his Reckoning, & summe of his charge
in the point of Equiuocation.

Rock pag. 444. He will neuer be able to shew out of *Sotus*, that all Equiuocators are liars; this assertion is an incredible impudencie, because *Sotus* saith, that in some cases it is lawfull to equiuocate, as where hee teacheth a man, that is asked vniustly, to answer, *Nescio, Qui iure intelligitur, Nescio, vt dicam, aut Nescio eo modo, quo iure debeam dicere, &c.* * This wrote I in my former booke, and hauing conuincd so eident falsifications, as heere haue been laid downe, quite contrary to the meaning and sense of the Author alleaged, I marvel that some little place had not been allowed for some piece of Answer to this also among the rest. But belike *M. Morton* was not readie.

Sotus lib. de legend. secretis, nu. 3. q. 3. conclus. 4.
* *Rock, pa. 445.*

The Review.

2 I was as ready then, as now, to tell you that heerein you play a kinde of *Scotus* and subtle Sophister with mee, wilfully abusing both your owne knowledge, and your Readers

ders ignorance, by not acknowledging the principall point in question, which was not against *Verball*, but only against that *Mentall Equivocation*, which hath been described by your selfe to be lawfull, whensoever the speaker shall reserve any thing in his minde, which according to his understanding doth agree with the outward words of his mouth, be the clause of reservation whatsoever it pleaseth him to imagine; As to say, *I am no Priest*, meaning, with purpose to tell it you. All such kinde of mixt propositions you in your Treatise of *Mitigation* do absolutely defend: Which (I say againe & againe) is by *Sotus* reiected as mere lying; which I shall easily proove out of *Sotus* his positions and examples, from the same booke wherein you have insisted.

3 If we would know what kinde of *Equivocation Sotus* will allow, let vs consult with him in his positions. First,

* He that is insuriously examined may use all kinde of *Amphibologies*, or doubtfull speeches, so as they may be understood in

some vsuall sense without a lie. He admitteth not *Equivocating*

in any sense, which is not by the use signified in the outward speech it selfe: and of this kinde is (in his iudgement) the

word, *Nescio*, in the cause before mentioned, whereof *Sotus* saith,

* Words doe carrie that signification which the people apprehend; and Christian people, when they heare a Priest (who

is asked whether he know such a mans sinne) answer, *Se nihil scire*, do understand his meaning to be, that he knoweth it not

extra confessionem: which maketh a verball *Equivocation*, or *Amphibologie*, the knowing of a Priest being of two sorts,

In confessione, and *Extra confessionem*. So that the man which is asked, whether he knoweth that which he heard only by

relation from another, may (in the opinion of *Sotus*) answer

* *Nescio*, because a man properly knoweth that which hee comprehendeth by strong reason. And this *Amphibologie* is

verball, for *Nescio* hath a double sense in it selfe, according to the vnderstanding of men, properly signifying that which I

do certainly not know; and vnproperly that which I know but vnertainly, and by report: And thus, saith *Sotus*,

* the Priest may answer, *Nescio*, because he had it but by relation

* *Sotus de leg. gend. Secret.*

membr. 1. q. 3. concl. 1. pag. 291.

Sotus falsly

and grossly

abused by

M. Parsons.

ibid. conclus. 2. pag. 299.

ibid. pa. 300

ibid. pa. 301.

of the partie consitent, who might (peradventure) haue lied.
 * Ibid. Concluf. * Except the matter be manifest, and so he proceedeth to ap-
 4. pag. 304. proue [†] Nescio; in such a case to signifie, by the intendment
 † Ibid. pa. 307. of the law, *Non scire, vt dicam, or, vt debeam dicere*. To con-
 clude, * *Sotus* neuer alloweth any other Equiuocall sense,
 which is wholly infolded in the clause of *Reseruation*, but
 that only which the outward speech it selfe may (in his opi-
 nion) carrie in the common vse, according to the apprehen-
 sion of the discret hearer: which, in the opinion of *Sotus*, is
 a verball Equiuocation. And this matter may be demon-
 strated by his examples.

2 Ibid. Concluf.
 4. pag. 314.

Sotus his ex-
 amples.

M. Persons
 falsehood in
 not acknow-
 ledging the
 iudgement
 of *Sotus* by
 whom his E-
 quiuocation
 is proued a
 starke lie.

2 *Sotus* ibid.
 Concluf. 5.

Another ex-
 ample.

4 First, * If a Tyrant aske a Priest, whether Peter killed
 John, which the Priest knew in confession: whether he may
 answer, *He killed him not, reseruing, That I may tell you*, *Sotus*
 resolueth that this answer cannot free the Priest from a
 lie: for (saith *Sotus*) *It were a most foolish exposition to say,*
Non occidit, Vt dicam, because *facta ordinem immediatum non*
habent ad hoc, quod est, Dicere. Let vs compare our new
Equiuocators with *Sotus*. M. Parsons admitteth any *Reser-*
uation, which being mixt with the outward speech, ma-
 keth a true proposition, as, *I am no Priest*, conceiuing in my
 minde, *To tell it*: which differeth not from that of *Sotus*, *He*
murdered him not, reseruing, *That I may tell it you*: which
Sotus cannot excuse from a lie. A second example. When
 a party is *Unjustly*, demanded, concerning a fact which he
 had committed, *Whether he may answer, Non feci, I did it not*:
Scotus (saith * *Sotus*) inclineth to the negative part, And I (saith
Sotus) cannot be perswaded that it is lawful to answer, *Non feci*,
 neither can I perceiue, how it can be excused from a lie: for if any
 way this might be, then especially by vnderstanding in his minde,
Vt dicam, That I may tell you. But this sense were most vio-
 lent: for the fact hath not any such order to the speech. Yet doth
 this mixt speech make a true proposition, which vttered
 in part with the mouth (in the iudgement of *Sotus*) cannot
 be excused from a lie: and consequently M. Parsons his art
 of *Equiuocating* is an art of starkely lying.

5 An other example: we haue often heard of the story
 of

of *S. Francis* his fleeces, which for the time we will suppose to be true : He, when a malefactor was pursued by officers, being asked whether he saw the malefactor passe by, or no ? Answered, *Non transiit hac*, that is, *He passed not this way*, (meaning, as *Sotus* readeth it, *per sinum*, as others, *per manicas*) through his sleewe: This example our *Equiuocators* vse to vrge, to the end that they may couer their lying deuice with *S. Francis* his sleewe: but if we belceue *Sotus*, that sleewe is too short to hide so long a lie: for *This deuice* (saith he) *will not content me, because although he that is vniustly asked a question, be not bound to answer vnto the intention of the demandant, yet is he bound to hide a secrecy in such words, which are true in a sense which is receiued either among the people, or else among wise and discreet men.* Heere *Sotus* iudgeth a Menrall Reseruatiō, agreeing with the minde of the speaker, to be no better than a lie, euen because the outward speech will not carry the secret sense, in the vnderstanding of discreet hearers. Which is the whole and onely point, which in my dispute against the Romish *Equiuocation* I vnderooke to prooue. And lest thar any might thinke that their *Equiuocating* deuice were any way sanctified by touch, as it were, of *S. Francis* his sleewe, *Sotus* opposeth against that a contrary example out of *S. Augustine*, as followeth.

6 Another example. *S. Augustine* raporteth another example: *There was a Bishop* (saith he) *whose name was Firme*, but himselfe was firmer in his resolution, who hiding a man that was pursued by officers, and being asked, who it was, answered onely thus: *I may neither lie, nor yet betray the party: and thereupon he himselfe was carried to be tortured, who suffered torment, yet through his patience he obtained fauor of the Emperor for the deliuerance of the man that had fled vnto him.* This being by *Sotus* opposed vnto the former example of *S. Francis* doth teach vs that he would not allow our *Equiuocators* pretense, who would haue readily answered that question by saying, *No-body*, meaning, *To tell it vnto you*: and *S. Augustine* his *Firmus* in these daies would be hissed out of their schooles for a simple and wiesle fellow euen as our *Equi-*

S. Francis his
lying sleewe.

Ibid. p. 318.

Ibid.

Another ex-
ample out of
S. Augustine.

Æquiuocators would (if they had liued in these daies) been driuen out of Christendome for gracelesse mon. banks. But heare what followeth.

Another example, confusing Romish *Æquiuocators*.

¹ *Ibid.* Concluf. 7 p. 319.

7 Another example. Before he delivereth this example, he propoundeth a *Conclusion*, which is principally to be obserued. In the case of a man who is wrongfully questioned about a most secret fault, ¹ *If (saith Sotus) he cannot finde words, whereby, through an Æquiuocation, which is in the common vse of men, he may conuer his fault without a lie, he ought rather to die than lie.* Still we finde, that whatsoever the *Æquiuocation* be, it ought to be such as consisteth in the common vse of the words themselves. And therefore where the question is, concerning a guilty person, who killed *Peter*, and is examined thereabout, *Whether he may answer, I haue not killed him*, conceiuing in his minde another man of the same name *Peter*, being one whom indeed he killed not: *Such an answer (saith Sotus) cannot be without a lie, because according to the receiued vse of all men, an affirmation and negation in proper names are so taken for the same man, as if this onely had been thereby signified, viz. for that Peter, of whom the question was asked.* How then shall their *Æquiuocating Priest* auoid the guilt of a *lie*, who being asked, whether he were a Priest, Answered, *No*, meaning, *A Priest of Apollo*, the heathenish God. And being demanded whether he were cuer beyond the *Sea*, answered, *No*, meaning, the *Adriatique Sea*. We see that heere also their *Sotus* meeteth with their *Æquiuocator*, to prooue him alier.

The last example to the same purpose. ² *Ibid.* pa. 322

8 The last example. ² *But what shall the guilty miserable woman doe, when her husband shall constraine her by violence to confesse whether she had committed Adultrie, or no, and shee cannot finde any amphibologie, to hide her selfe in? I answer (saith he) That the iniquities of men are more than that wee can prevent them: therefore in such a case it is better to die, than to transgresse by lying.* This had beene but a fond Resolution, if he had thought that *Nescio, ut dicam*, would haue serued the turne, which to free the speech from a lie, notwithstanding is the *maxima lex*, in the profession, and practise of

our

our Equiuocators, and whereby it is most easie to preuent all guiles of the most subtile Interrogatories. In briefe; in the shutting vp of this Treatise hee granteth that *Words which haue not a true sense; according to the signification, which is receined into common vse, cannot bee excused from a lie.* Which conclusion, with all these premisses, I leaue as a Glasse vnto *M. Parsons*; and other Professors of *Mentall Equiuocation*, to looke their faces in, and at their leasure to tell mee what they see. From the Spanish Doctor *Soim*, hee goeth to a Flemmish Doctor *Cunerus*.

S E C T. II.

The summe of the sixteeneth charge of
M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

CVNERUS is no lesse iniuriously alleaged than the former: for *Rechen pag. 444 445.*
Cunerus saying, In religione concordia sola est ratio vt omnes, &c. that is, *This in religion is the onely way of concord, that all men with a pious minde doe wholly conserue and practise that which is taught in the Catholike Church of Rome: Maister Morton translates it; This is the onely true religion; which is taught in the Church of Rome. What dealing is this? &c.* *Cunerus de offi. Princ. cap. 13.*

The Review.

9 Any man may perceiue what kind of fish *M. Parsons* *M Parsons a*
is, who can thus carpe at words, puerly concealing the meere Car-
plaine intention of the Author *Cunerus*: hee intending to per.
proue the Hollanders to be Rebels against the K. of Spaine,
who were not possibly to expect concord, except first they
would consent in one Religion, and that there is no true re- *Cunerus, pag. 131.*
ligion but that of the Church of Rome, *Whereunto* (saith
Cunerus) *a Christian Prince is sworne to be a defender of the* *Cunerus, pag. 133.*
faith, namely of that Romish, and therefore he wil haue that
King, as Sara, to cast out Agar and her some, so to remove out
of Holland all of the contrarie profession of Religion. If
then he allowing no possibilitie of Concord, without consent

in religion; and no Religion; but that which is Romish, doth he not evidently say that the Romish is the onely Religion? I am vexed with *M. Parsons* his vanities, and desire something materiall. Peradventure we shall finde it in the next instance.

S E C T. III.

The seuenteenth charge. *M. PARSONS*
his Reckoning.

Rec. on. p. 446. **N**OW we come to an other abuse pertaining to two men indifferently, to wit, *Cassander* a *Germane Schoolmaster*, and *Bellarmino* a *Cardinall*: but wee shall ascribe it rather to the *Germane* for this present for that we have had diuerse examples about *Cardinall Bellarmine* before.

The Review.

M. Parsons idle and fond collusion. **I**O Shal I attribute this omitting of my *Abuse of Bellarmine* vnto *M. Parsons* his remissnesse, or rather to his barrennesse, and indeed fondnesse? who offereth to Reckon for an abuse of *Bellarmino*, and yet will not tell what it is. Wherein *M. Parsons* abuseth *Bellarmino* (in my opinion) bringing him vpon his stage, to no other end than (as *Cato* went into the Senate) to carrie him out againe. But what of *Cassander*? I would heare first something of the man, and then of the matter.

The summe of *M. PARSONS* his
Reckoning.

Rec. pag. 448. **F**inding my selfe weary with prosecuting the labyrinth of his intricate sugling trickes, I will draw to an end, adding only one example more in this place. First to pretermis that he goeth about to deceiue his Reader by the opinion of gravity, and learning in *George Cassander* of *Bruges*, who was but a *Grammarians* in his diuies: and thus bee was a *Catholike*, who is confuted for an Heretike

Heretike prime Clavis in the Index of prohibited books: and not only for heresies of his time, but also quod dicit Spiritum S. minus aduocandum, & adorandum esse. &c.

The Review:

11 It were good you knew how to make an end, and better it had beene for you in your reputation, that you had not begunne at all with this taxation of *Cassander*, it is so notoriously shamelesse: for (I beseech you *M. Parsons*) what great cause haue you to condemne a *Grammatician*, how much lesse to say that *Cassander* was but a *Grammatician*? As though hee had beene vnworthy of any better esteeme, whom both the Emperor *Ferdinand*, and *Maximilian King of the Romanes* sent for (about the time of the Councell of Trent) and made singular choise of him, before any other Doctor, with whom they might consult, concerning the weightiest points of controuersie in Religion, and in that respect was he commended by the Emperor for a man of singular learning, and godlinesse, and intituled, *Theologus*, that is, a *Divine*: and by *Maximilian* hee was extolled for a man godly, learned, and discreet, & bene versatus in sacris literis, that is, *One very conversant in holy Scriptures*, of whom we haue need, saith *Maximilian*.

His shame-
lesse falsity.

Cassander his
estimation.

See *Cassan-*
der his booke
De Consult.
printed at
Colen, 1577.
where are
the letters of
the Emperor
Ferdinand, and
Maximilian.

12 Who may not hereby perceiue with what eies *M. Parsons* looked vpon this so rare and excellent a *Divine* (as the testimonies of those Princes, and his own writing shew) in whom notwithstanding hee can see nothing but a *Grammatician*? Which sauoreth of an enuious detraction, even as his next exception doth taste of vanity, in alleaging their *Index Expurgatorius* as though it were euidence enough to proue one no Catholike. Those that haue read that *Index* know that it often purgeth out of Authours more good bloud, than grosse humors. And whether any such words bee in *Cassander*, concerning the holy Ghost, or in what sense hee speaketh them, I haue not yet obserued: this is plaine, that his whole works doe magnifie the Deitie of the

His enuious
detraction a-
gainst *Cassan-*
der.

Their *Index*
Expurgato-
rius.

holy Ghost, and also doe inlarge mans duetie in the worship of the blessed spirit of Grace.

13 Afterwards *M. Parsons* anatomizeth, as it were, the whole text of *Cassander*, cauilling about vnnecessarie, and impertinent termes: for the scope of all was to shew that Protestants (in the opinion of *Cassander*) were held to bee *Veramembra Christi*, that is, *The true members of Christ*; and that Princes were to seeke to establish a peace of religion betweene them, and the Romanists. To what end then are *M. Parsons* his other skirmishes; wherewith he beatech the aire? Onely onething excepted, which concerneth *Cassander*, to know what profession he was of, seeing *M. Parsons* can not abide his Acquaintance, as will further appeare.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

The summe.

Reck. pag. 450.
& 451.

Thirdly he doth most notably cogge, in thrusting in the word, à nobis, meaning thereby to make *Cassander* seeme a Catholike, and to speake in the behalfe of Catholikes. And then hee translateth Catholikes, Papists, as though *Cassander*, if hee were a Catholike, would call vs Papists.

The Review.

14 By *M. Parsons* his censure *Cassander* is not to bee called a Catholike, nor yet may Catholikes bee called Papists. First of *Cassander*. That my Reader may know that I was as farre from coggerie, as *M. Parsons* is from true modesty in his denials: I shall but desire him to obserue that *Cassander* in the same booke of *Consult. Art. 7.* in defence of the Romane Church, saith; *Verum, nil tam graue in Pontificis NOSTROS dici potest, quod non in Sacerdotes Iudaici populi conueniat*; that is, Nothing (saith he) can be spoken against OUR Popes, which might not aswell bee objected against the Priests of the Iewes. Thus he inserteth himselfe in the number of Papists. Secondly, he was held to be a Papist of Protestants,

M. Parsons
his faithlesse
dealing with
Cassander.

Cassander,
Art. 7.

testants, as by ¹ *Osiander*, and ² *Beza*. Thirdly, some Ro-³ *Osiander in*
manists themselves have acknowledged him in their pub-⁴ *his Papa non*
like writings for theirs, as namely; ⁵ *Bartholomeus Nernius*,⁶ *Papa, epist. ad*
and ⁷ *Thuanus*, who reporteth of him, that hee was the in-⁸ *lectorem*
strument to draw *Baldwine* vnto the Romane religion. Not-⁹ *As Nernius*
withstanding as Mable of Windfor, that thought that there ¹⁰ *confesseib in his*
is no other part of the world which shee saw not within the ¹¹ *defence of*
compasse of her Horison, so *M. Parsons* cannot discerne a ¹² *Callander.*
Catholique except hee bee within the circumference of his ¹³ *In his defeuse*
owne seditious doctrines: in brieft, this deniall that *Callander* ¹⁴ *of Callander.*
was a professed Romanist, is an inexcusable falshood. ¹⁵ *Thuanus*
¹⁶ *bist. part. 3.*
¹⁷ *Anno. 1573.*
¹⁸ *pag. 107.*

15 If *M. Parsons* be disposed to see a notable coggerie in-
deed, he need but turne backe againe to a ¹ testimony of his ² *See above lib.*
owne cited out of *Caluin*, where to make *Caluin* an Adversa-³ *1. s. 12. num. 6.*
ry vnto all the ancient Fathers, in the point of prayer for the
dead, *M. Parsons* himselfe hath foisted in the word [*Omnies*] ⁴ *See above, lib.*
All, of his own, against the expresse meaning and resolution ⁵ *1. cap. 1.*
of *M. Caluin*, in that very place. This is properly *Coggerie*
to foist in a word which agreeth not vnto the truth of the
matter; whereof we haue ⁶ seen diuers examples in *Suares*,
Bellarmino, and *Gratian*.

16 Howsoever it giueth vs some cause of admiration,
that *M. Parsons* is ashamed of the name of a *Papist*, seeing
that the word [*Papists*] commeth of *Papa*, that is, *The Pope*, The name of
to whom *M. Parsons* profelleth subiection; as a matter ne-¹ *Papist held*
cessary to Saluation; how can he then abhor his owne fir-² *both as glori-*
name? His fellow ³ *Cochelet* is more zealous in the defence ⁴ *ous and odi-*
of that title, *We are Papists* (saith he) and confesse it and glory ⁵ *ous among*
in that name. And Doctor ⁶ *Stapleton* maketh *Papists* and *Cath-*
olikes to be Synonymies. But why doe we busie and abuse ⁷ *the Roma-*
our Reader with discourse about such impertinencies? ⁸ *nists.*
⁹ *Anast. Coche-*
¹⁰ *let. Polestic.*
¹¹ *honoris &c. p.*
¹² *9. & 6.*
¹³ *Stapleton*
¹⁴ *Doltr. print. li.*
¹⁵ *4. s. 2. ad finem.*

SECT. IV.

The eighteenth charge. M. PARSONS
his Reckoning.

Drawing to an end, I am forced to ioyne diuerse together,
whereof I accused him in my former writing to haue corrupted
¹ *Recken. pag.*
² *452.*

red two Authors ioyntly, Royard a Friar, and Cuncerus a Bishop.

The Review.

17 Be not offended if that which you deliuer in grosse, Two together, I utter by retale, yet so, as to keepe your owne order, which is to let your Friar Vsher your Bishop.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reck. pag. 453.

It is not credible to him, that hath not compared the booke themselves, how he hath abused diuers Authors: As for example, Royardus the Franciscan Friar is brought in with commendation of an honest Friar, for that he saith; That a king, when he is made by the people, can not be depofed by them again at their pleasure: which is the same doctrine that all other Friars and learned Catholike do holde, so long as he containeth himselfe within the nature of a King: for that otherwise (which is the question in controuersie) Royard himselfe saith, Parendum ei non esse, That he is not to be obeyed. But this is not to be indged by the people and their mutiny, as Protestant Doctours do teach.

Dominic 23.
post. penecost.
Con. 2.

The Review.

18 This *M. Parsons* hath brought in for a choice example, among diuers, of (as he saith) an incredible abuse of my Authours: therefore I desire my Reader to esteeme of choise diuers others, by this, wherein he doth particularly insist, and it will proue *M. Parsons* to be an incredible Accuser: for the sentence of *Royard* standeth thus: *Although there be in the people a freedome of election, yet, after they haue chosen a King, they haue no power to remoue the yoke, but stand in necessity of subiection.* *M. Parsons* hath surueyed the sentence, and can not take any exception to the citation of it, wherein he saw that Friar *Royard* preached vnto the people a Necessitie of subiection, so farre, as Not to remoue the King, whom they haue once chosen. Which conclusion, as *M. Parsons* knoweth, doth condemne the now positions of their Iesuits, and

^a Full satisfact.
part. 1. p. 37.

^b Royard. Sermon.
2. in dom. 23.
post. Penecost.

and especially *M. Parsons* his *Dalman* proving them indeed to be no better than rebellious. How will *M. Parsons* avoid so plaine a witnesse of their own *Friar*? Marke, I pray thee, Christian Reader, (for this trick he fetcheth out of the bot-^{egregious} *M. Parsons* some of his budget) by a false repetition of the sentence, as ^{fallhood,} if it had been thus: *That a King, when he is made by the people,* ^{misiciting the} *can not be deposed by them againe at their pleasure:* whereby ^{iudgement} he turneth *Royards* necessitie of subiection of the people, and ^{of Royard.} their not having any power to remove the yoke, into not removing him only at their pleasure. Is this good dealing? but the necessitie of his cause did constrain him to this shift, because there was no other meanes to make this *Friar* and ^{Royard. serm.} himselfe friends and professors of the same doctrine, but only ^{1. Rom. 1.} by abusing the sentence of *Royard*, and making it not to be ^{Adventu.} the same.

19 His next guile and cunning is, by inquiring into another Tome of *Royard*, to finde out (if he might) some sentence to counterpoise the former: which paines needed not; ^{M. Parsons} if hee could have shifted himselfe honestly of the former, ^{next wilfull} without notorious fraud. But at length, after much fishing, all ^{& notorious} that hee hath catched is but this poore gudgeon. A King, ^{fallitie.} saith *Royard*, must not be obeyed, when he commandeth any thing contrary vnto godlinesse, which (saith *M. Parsons*) is the controuersie: which is his godlesse fallitie, for looke the place in my *Full Satisfact. part. 1. pag. 31* the controuersie, there set downe, was not whether people are bound to obey the vnlawfull command of their Kings; but whether they have power to depose them. The Apostles being commanded, not to preach the Gospel, answered, ^{Royard. dom.} whether it be better to obey God or man, iudge you: yet did they not teach the people to resist such Commanders, and to hold them for no Magistrates. And *Royard* in this place, now cited by *M. Parsons*, insisteth in the fact of *S. Ambrose*, who obeyed not the Emperor, but reprehended him; but yet did not *Ambrose* reachmen to depose him. I would propound an argument to *M. Parsons*, but I doubt he wil stumble vpon it, and fall & breake his forehead. It should bee this: If the Pope should command ^{21. post Pentecost. serm. 2.}

command him any thing, which is directly against Gods commandement, would *M. Parsons* obey him? He would not, for then he should make the Pope his God: but in not obeying him, would he seeke to *depose him*? He would not; for he hath taught, that for wickednesse of maners the Pope may not be iudged by any. Whereupon it followeth, that thesetwo, viz. the *not obeying*, and the *deposing of Kings*, are not the same controuersies.

A Dilemma.

A. Gellim.

A similitude.

20 Therefore may I easily allege against *M. Parsons* the saying which a Philosopher vsed against a fond Disputer; *Hic homo sine controuersia doctus est*; This man without controuersie is very learned, for in controuerting he sheweth no learning or very little. To conclude, *M. Parsons* hath shewed vs two singular knacks of leger-demaine; the one is, the wilfull peruerting of the testimonie of *Royard*, changing a *necessitie* of not remouing the yoke, into *not remouing at their pleasure*; which are two contrary senses: the second, by changing the state of the *Controuersie*, to wit, the *Deposing of a Kings person* into *Disobeying the Kings vniust command*. We leaue the *Friar*, and draw neere the *Bishop*.

The summe of the charge. M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reck. pag. 453.
Full Satisfact.
part. 1. pa. 30.
Cicerus lib. de
offic. Princ. c. 5.

He citeth *Cicerus*, though brokenly, testifying that it lieth not in the peoples hand to reiect their Prince at their pleasure: But *Cicerus* saith nothing against vs but against the Rebels of *Flanders*, & altogether for vs, who notwithstanding this exact obedience, which we require of subiects to their lawfull Princes, hath a speciall Chapter expressly proouing that in some causes the Common wealth and the Church haue authority to restraine and remove them. What falsehood is this, to allege *Anthonis* flatly against their meaning? doth this become a Minister of simple truth? is this for a man, who so much abhorreth *Equiuocation*? So I said to *M. Morton* at that time, when I expected he would returne some answer to my demand: The like I doe repeat againe now, and will attend what may come from him hereafter.

The

The Review.

21 I am sorry that I haue beene so long in your debt, and therefore now vpon the second sight of your Reckoning I hope to make all strait by an answer which will be, I doubt, lesse acceptable vnto you, in giuing you to vnderstand that you are, *M. Parsons*, in this Reckoning, a most vnconscionable person, in imputing vnto me matter of falsehood heerein. For the doctrine which I there sought to refell, was the opinion of your Iesuit ¹ *Salmeron*. *If a Catholike King* ¹ *Full Satisfact.* *(saith Salmeron)* shall fall to be an Heretike, or an Apostate, ^{part. 1. pag. 29.} *reason willeth that among Catholike people he be remooued from* ¹ *Salmeron in* *the government of the Common-wealth: but why? Because the* ^{epi. Pauli in ge-} *power was first in the people, then in the King, and is deriued from* ^{nerie disp. 12. §.} *the King to the people.* This reason I confuted by the testimo- ¹ *Iam de.* *nies out of your owne Docters, the first was Royard, who* *M. Parsons is* *said, that the people had not any power to remooue the yoke:* *vnconsciona-* *the second testimony was out of Cuiuers, which standeth* *bly iniurious.* *thus: Some say that the authority of Princes dependeth vpon* ¹ *Cuiuers lib. de* *the courttesie of the people, as thinking, that they, who gaue con-* ¹ *offic. Princ. c. 5* *sent to choose a King, haue power likewise to depose him. But* *(proouing this from Scriptures) wherefoeuer a King is establi-* *shed by the consent of the Kingdome, this ordinance is of God, and* *the people must obey. Which flatly contradicterh the former* *Conclusion of Salmeron. And further than this I did not med-* *dle with the opinion of Cuiuers. Therefore in this charge* *you haue plaied either the Equiuocator, or the flat (apostrophe-)* *sis; or both.*

22 Furthermore, to satisfie your expectation to the full, if I had stepped a degree further in alleaging Cuiuers, your owne *Barckley* would euen out of Cuiuers haue iustified my Conclusion: for he (vnder standing, by people, ¹ *All them* ¹ *Barcl. lib. 5.* *who are associated together vnder one ciuill law, in one common-* ¹ *contra Monar-* *wealth, of what kinde, age, wisdom, dignity, soeuer they be* ¹ *cho. c. 12. p. 385.* *doth prooue out of Cuiuers, That the King hath not his au-* ¹ *Lib. 3 c. 12.* *thority onely from the consent and conuention made betwene the* *people*

Obserue a
necessary do-
ctrine, and
forcible e-
nough to con-
found there-
belleously af-
fected.

people and the King, but from the ordinance of God: and that he that resisteth this authority, doth violate the constitution of God. And (out of his 7. Chapter) That the Scripture euery where witnesseth, that albeit Kings doe sinne, yet may they not be resisted with armes, or violence, but are to be iudged of him, who is greater than all Kings, which is that wisdom and truth, which crieth, Heare, O Kings, and vnderstand. &c. Which he illustrateth by an example of Ioa, an idolatrous King of Iudah, who most cruelly put the Prophet Zachary to death, and was slaine by the hands of his owne seruants in his bed-chamber: who after that fact were iustly slaine by Amaziah the King and next Successor vnto Ioa in the Kingdome of Iudah. It will therefore stand M. Parsons vpon (if he affect truth) to compare this of Barckley and their Cumerus together and trie how he can reconcile either Barckley with Cumerus or else Cumerus with himselfe. M. Parsons his next passage is vnto our Countryman Sayer.

SECT. V.

The summe of the nineteenth charge. M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Recken pa. 454.
455.

Sayer lib. 1. cap.
confr. 9.

Of Sayer he alleageth this sentence: An obstinate Hereticke is he that is presumed to be, as he that is manifest: but Sayer speaketh not of heresie, but onely of him, who may be excommunicated by a Iudge, for contumacy, in not appearing; which is a different thing from obstinacy or pertinacy, and this whether he be an Hereticke or Catholike. And he defineth contumacy to be nothing else but a certaine disobedience, whereby he is not obied that sitteth in iudgement: and putting down two sorts of contumacies, either manifest, or by presumption; manifest, if a man being cited doth refuse openly to appeare or obey the Iudge: by Presumption, when he is presumed to be contumacious, and so may excommunication, if it be a spirituall court, proceed against him, as if contumacy were manifest. Is Master Morton so simple in Diuinity, as not to discerne betweene Contumax, and Pertinax,

nax, whereof the one is a disobedieney towards Superiours, the other is a tenacity of opinion, as hath beene defined?

The Review.

23 If *M. Parsons* would be so equal, as to allow me that, which hee in his owne defence hath alleaged and pretended for himselfe, which is, the excuse of lapse of memory concerning tearmes, then can I not be inexcusable herein, because at that time I could not see the booke of *Sayer*. And although every *Pertinax* bee not a *Contumax*, yet every *Contumax* is *Pertinax*. If I had dealt with *Sayer*, as their Iesuite *Snarez* is confessed to have done with a testimony of *Aquinas*, when in stead of *preordination he put in *Subordination, which are flat contrary, then might it well have become *M. Parsons* to call it (according to this Reckoning) *The most faithlesse deceit, and corruption that ever any honest man put to paper against an Adversary*. For this change of termes doth fully contradict the Authors meaning, which he did, because the word of *Aquinas* would have overthrowen his whole cause.

24 But if we take the testimony of *Sayer*, which *M. Parsons* will acknowledge to be truly his, it will sufficiently proove the principall matter, which I then intended, which was especially to know in what case Protestants may be thought to stand, by the principles of *Sayer*, and whether they may not lie vnder the Romish excommunication, and so be made liable to their cruell censures, before any publike and parsonall premonition by name. Shall we heare *Sayer* discoursing vpon the nature of excommunication? *There is an excommunication (saith he) of man, and another of law: in excommunication by man the party inobedient must first be admonished; but in excommunication by the law it is sufficient that the admonition be generall, which is made of him, who is the Author of the law, whereupon it hapneth, that he who offendeth against the admonition of the law, doth thereby fall presently into*

M. Parsons maliciously snatcheth at words and shadows, and wittingly loseth the substantiall matter.

Sayer de casib. conse. lib. 1. ca. 12. §. Primò suè.

The doctrine of *Sayer* is prejudiciall vnto the State of Protestants.

ⁱⁿ *Ibidem*, §. Quartus est.

ⁱⁿ *Ibid.*, §. Primus est.

excommunication. " There are certaine caſes, wherein the perſonall citation and admonition is not neceſſary, to wit, when it is not given againſt any particular perſon, but generally, which is when it is given for future offences, ſuch as are all the cenſures which are given by law, for that the law doth alwaies admoniſh, leſt that any commit a crime which it forbiddeth : in which caſe there is not any other admonition neceſſary. Again, " When a man hath bene often mooved to repentance, ſeeing that now his contumacy is manifeſt, he may without any further admonition be excommunicated. Let then theſe rules be but applied againſt Proteſtants, whom they call Heretikes, and what ſhal wee need more for the knowledge of Sayr his iudgement concerning the cauſe it ſelfe? *M. Parsons* would rather haue pondered the matter, than canuaſſed words, if he had not bene ſtronger in raging than in reaſoning.

CHAP. IIII.

Containing an Answer to other three charges.

§. I.

The twentieth charge, concerning the point of *Equiuocation*, according the iudgement of *Cicero*.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reck. pag. 457.



Some Christians and Country-men bee paſſeth to Heathens, and committeth ſuch notorious falſhoods againſt one of them, euen then, and there where he ſpeaketh of faithfull dealing, againſt perfidiouſneſſe, as may iuſtly make any man admire, what hee did ſuppoſe his iudicious Reader would thinke of him, when hee ſhould ſee the fraud diſcloſed.

The Review.

I doubt that you will play the part of ſome Heathen rather than of a Chriſtian, before you diſpatch this peece of Reckoning

Reckoning. The Storie was thus deliuered. * *There was a* ^{Reck. p. 457.} *man* (saith Maister Morton) *who together with nine other prisoners, being dismissed out of the prison of Carthage, upon his oth, that hee within a prefixed time should returne againe: as soone as he was out of prison, hee returned, as though he had forgotten something, and by and by departeth home to Rome, where he staid beyond the time appointed, and answered that hee was freed from his oth. But see now the opinion of his owne Countryman Cicero, concerning this Equiuocation of returne. This was not well done (saith Tully) for that craft in an oth doth not lessen, but make the perjury more heinous. Wherefore the graue Senators of Rome sent this cousing mate backe againe to the prison of Haniball, their enemy, from whom he had escaped. &c. This example of sincerity in that Heathenish Rome I obiected against the now Christian Rome, to confute the ordinarie doctrine and praïse of Equiuocating. The exceptions, which M. Parsons taketh, are partly for the method, partly for the meaning of Cicero.*

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Marke then the deportment of this man in this one point, and Reckon p. 458. *if you knew him not before, learne to know him by this. First then I would haue some Grammar-scholar, that studieth Tullies offices, so turne to the places here quoted, and comparing them with that which this Minister setteth downe in English, consider how they hang together, and how hee picketh out one sentence in one place, and another in another, and leapeth forth and backe to make some coherence of speech, contrarie to the Authors order, sense, and method, as is ridiculous to behold, and fit for the cousing mate, of whom he talketh in his text.*

The Review.

2 I did thinke that M. Parsons could not haue so soone forgot his grosse absurdity in syllogizing, which I commended vnto the examination of his Scholars, & wherof he hath

M. Parsons
plaieth both
fondly and
falsly vpon a
wrong firing.

beene so much ashamed, as that being charged for changing the *Copula*, which in the *Maior* was [*Maketh*] the *Iudges* competent, into [*Are*] competent *Iudges* in the conclusion, which was the great blot and losse of his whole game. Therefore I presumed that hee would bee wary, in calling young *Scholars* any more to witnesse betweene vs. The place is knowne in *Tullie* his *offic. lib. 3.* it beginneth at, *Sic decem. &c.* and endeth at, *Ad Hannibalem ducerentur*: If I haue mis-reported the substance of the *Storie*, or made any excursion out of the due compasse thereof, then let his *Scholar-boies* (for I desire not to trouble men with these triflings) hold mee worthy of his taxation. As for the calling of the place *Carthage*, which *Tully* nameth *Castra*, *quorum erant potiri Puni*, that is, *The campe*, which the *Carthaginians* did hold, and wherein the man was kept prisoner, it cannot helpe or hinder the point of *Equiuocating*. Now come wee to the matter.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reck. pag. 459.

The most notorious *consenages*, that he peruerteth all *Cicero* his meaning, words sense, and discourse in this matter, alleaging them quite contrary to himselfe, as before you haue heard him doe many other *Authors*, so hee beliethe and corrupteth them all, both diuine and profane. And if in this one point hee can deliuer himselfe from *Punica fides*, I will say hee, plaieth the man indeed.

The Review.

M. Parsons is
a warie Gam-
ster.

3 If I shall free my selfe from the note of *consenage*, then all that *M. Parsons* will allow mee in the conquest is onely the reputation of a man: this is an excellent gamster, hee will cast at me, and aduenture nothing himselfe. But, good *M. Parsons*, if you will say that I haue plaied the man, when I haue freed my selfe from this slander of *consenage*, what will you giue mee leaue to call you, if the *consenage* shall fall vpon your

your selfe? May I not thinke, that you play the part not of man, but of that animal the *fox*, which you propounded vnto your Equiuocators, as a naturall example for their imitations? Let the wager be but indifferent, and I shall not refuse the Triall, whereunto I proceed.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

First, I say that if they sware absolutely to returne againe, if Reck. ibid. they obtained not their sute, they were bound truly and sincerely to performe the same. And secondly, that they being now iustly by law of armes prisoners of Hanniball, they were bound to sware sincerely to his intention, and not to any other reserved meaning of their owne, as in the former Chapter hath bene declared.

The Review.

4 Very good, they were Prisoners by the law of armes, and might not therefore violate their oath: some of yours who haue bene prisoners by the law of the land, according to the law of nature in cases of meere treason, sometime (notwithstanding their oathes vnto their keepers to bee true prisoners) haue made vse of their heeles and after their escape haue found intertainment and securitie in the now Rome. Neither may you answere, that such men sware not absolutely, but equivocatingly, for so (you know) did that faithlesse prisoner, whom the Senate therefore sent backe againe in a vengeance vnto Haniball. All this while we heare nothing of Mental Reseruation.

A comparison betweene
Heathenish
and some
Romish pri-
soners.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

This very doctrine also teacheth Cicero by light of nature, in these words perfidiously cut off, and left out by this Minister in the very same place, out of which he taketh the rest. Est autem (saith he) ius etiam bellicum, fidesque iurificandi (æpe hosti

Reckon. pa. 459.
460.

hosti seruanda : quod enim ita iuratum est, vt mens conciperet fieri oportere, id seruandum est : quod aliter id si non feceris, nullum perurium est. *There is also a law of armes (saith he) and a faith in our swearing to be obserued often times, euen vnto our enemy. For that which is so sworne by vs, as our mind doth conceiue that it must be done, this is to be obserued : but if it be otherwise sworne, that is no periuirie, if he performe it not. Beholde heere the very same distinction, which Catholike Diuines put downe of swearing according to the intention and vnderstanding of the swearer, or of him, to whom it is sworne : and that the former is, that bindeth and maketh periuirie, if it be not performed, and not alwaies the second, to wit, when any violence or force is vsed.*

The Review.

M. Persons
his miscon-
struction of
Tullies offi-
ces.

5 Behold heere a strange and strong delusion : *M. Parsons* collecteth from those words, [*That which is sworne, as our minde doth conceiue that it must be done, that is to be obserued : but if it be otherwise sworne, that is no periuirie, if he performe it not,*] that *Cicero* did vnderstand some reserued clause conceined in the minde mixed with the outward speech, to make vp one full proposition, such as is their Priestly Equiuocation, *I am no Priest*, conceiuing inwardly, with purpose to tell it vnto you : which kinde of mixture neuer came vnto the fantasie of *Cicero*, or yet of any heathen Writer. But his meaning may be easily explained, thus : *That which is sworne as our minde conceiueth, must be done* : that is, when we sweare vnto any, to whom wee conceiue that we owe faithfulnessse, albeit they be euen our hostile enemies, vnto whom (as hee speaketh in the words immediatly going before) there is a faithfulnessse due, according by the common law of armes, *That oath is to be obserued*, and may not be broken : *but if wee sweare otherwise*, that is, vnto them vnto whom wee thinke that there is no fidelitie due, such as are *Pirats*, that oath, although it be not performed, yet is it not periuirie, that is, in the exterior Court of men, because *Pirats*, and such perfidious kinde of men (of whom he speaketh in the next words) who
are

are transgressors of the law of Nations, haue no authoritie to iudge it periurie.

6 If this exposition, concerning the outward Court of man, do not satisfie *M. Parsons*, I shall not refuse to ioyne issue vpon the inward Court of the minde and conscience. And the proposition of *Sin aliter* in *Tullie* truly resolved standeth thus: If I sweare any thing, thinking in my minde that I ought not to do it, this is no periurie, although I shall not performe it. If our Equiuocators will allow this proposition, then must they say that no man can be periured in swearing any thing, which he thinketh to be vnlawfull; but this is incredible: If they will condemne it, then must they also condemne *M. Parsons* for a profane man, who esteemeth of this impious doctrine, as of a *Catholike* trueth, especially seeing they can not finde their clause of Mentall reservation in all this: for when a man sweareth with his mouth, saying, *This I will giue thee*, and in his minde shall conceiue, yet I will not giue thee this, because I ought not; these are two diuerse, and partly contradictorie propositions, and make not a mixt proposition, which is the only point that the Equiuocators do defend. This will be more manifest by the example following.

A Dilemma.

MR. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Which Cicero doth expresse in the very next immediat words, by the selfe same example, that Azor vsed before: Si prædō nibus pactum pro capite precium non attuleris, nulla fraus est: ne si iuratus id non feceris, &c. If thou should not pay the price or ransome vnto publike theeues, which was agreed between you for sauing of your life, it is no deceit, no though you had sworne to performe it, &c. Reck. pag. 460.

The Reniew.

7 Methinke I doe perceiue an (&c.) there: Yea *M. Parsons*? can you play the gelder so openly; to cut off the

Hh

words

M. Parsons
his excellent
piece of craft,
in cutting off
words of Ci-
cero, which
are of most
importance.

words which follow, and are of so great importance ? to wit these ; *Nam Pirata non est ex perduellium numero definitus, sed communis hostis omnium : cum hoc nec fides esse debet, nec insurandum commune.* That is, For a Pirat is not to be reckoned in the number of enemies (meaning such, with whom we ought to keepe fidelitie, for *Perduelles* in this place is no more than *πλάμωι*) but is the common enemy of all, with whom there ought not to be common faith, or oath. This verifieth my former exposition, concerning the outward Court of man, supposing that the meaning of *Cicero* is, that seeing Theeves and Robbers are outlawes, the oath which shall not be kept with them cannot be periury, and so censured by any law of man : for when there is no *Ius*, which is to be violated, there can be no *periurium*. And in all this there is no note of our Equivocators mixt clause of *Reservation*, which the sequell will more fully explaine.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Recken. ps. 460.
461.

It followeth in Cicero : Non enim falsum iurare peierare est, sed si ex animi tui sententia iuraveris, sicut verbis concipitur more nostro, id non facere, periurium est : scit enim Euripides, Iuravi lingua, mentem iniuratam gero. That is : It is no periurie to sweare false, (in any sort whatsoever) but if you sweare a thing which you determine in your minde, and do utter it in words according to the common custome of speech, and do not performe it, this is periurie : for well and fitly to the purpose saith the Poet Euripides, I have sworn with my tongue, but my minde hath not sworne. So he. And consider now, I pray you, the punica fides of our Minister against our Romane faith. He saith that Cicero and other Heathenish Romans shall rise up against us at the day of iudgement, for that they condemne all reservation or doubtfull sense in an oath, and do condemne it for periury : whereas Cicero affirmeth, that there is neither periury nor fraud therein. And the same Philosopher alloweth the very same example of sweareing, with a reserved intention, to a publike theefe without either meaning or obligation to performe it.

The

The Review.

8 This is soone said by you of *Cicero*, and may as easily be confuted out of *Cicero*, who held that the oath, which he spake of, is false, and also that notwithstanding the fallitie thereof, it was lawfull to vse it against theeves, who are law-
 lessmen : which piece of Philosophie our Christianitie did neuer allow.

Cicero can not patronize *M. Parsons* Equiuocating, except *M. Parsons* do professe and iustifie alie.

9 For prooffe that *Cicero* thought that to be lawfull, which Christians call a lie, we need not the coniectures of your *Sotus*, who saith, with a peraduenture, that *It was the opinion of some Philosophers, that it is lawfull to lie, for the auoiding of some grieuous euill, which they called a mercifull lie, whereof there is mention in Plato Tom. 3. de Repub. and in Cicero pro Q. Ligario. Of Plato there can be no difficultie, for he allowed Physicians to lie vnto their Patients, to the end that by cordiall words they might better reuine them.*

Sotus de se. 2. gener. secret. membr. 3. 4. 3.

10 As for the knowledge of *Cicero* his iudgement in this case, *Cicero* himselfe will suffice in this present place : for first (as we haue heard him say) *It is not periurie to sweare false*, thereby confessing that that oath, although made vnto a *Pirat* or theefe is false, because the promise vnto the theefe was to giue him something, but his intention was not to giue him any thing; Can there be a greater fallshood in speech? Yet hee calleth this *no periurie*, because this being done to theeves, who liue vnder no law of men, there is no law of man that will in that case condemne a man of periurie. But if contrariwise the like oath should be made vnto men, who liued vnder a common law, *Cicero* calleth it *periurie*, because in this case words are conceiued *more nostris*, that is, according vnto humane fashion of speech, which amongst ciuill men in the outward Court exacteth a performance, and not to do this is *periurie*. I would but demand of *M. Parsons*, If one of his Equiuocators should make such an oath to a theefe, which he meaneth not to performe, whether therein he sweare false, or no? If he shall say, *No*; then is he con-

The prooffe.

demned by *Cicero*, who saith that it was *falsum iurare*, that is, *to sweare a false thing*. If he say yea, then is not that true which they sweare, and consequently (howsoever it stand in the outward court of man) it being *false*, it must be in it selfe, and in the inward court of our conscience a flat *perjury*.

Cicero his
plaine lying
is brought in
by *M. Parsons*
to the coun-
tenancing of
his Equivo-
cating.

11. The second Argument issueth out of his application of the verse of *Enripedes*, alleaged by *M. Parsons*; *I have sworn with my tongue, but my minde hath not sworn*. So he, saith *M. Parsons*, whence he collecteth thus: *Cicero affirmeth that there is in such an oath neither fraud nor perjury*. So he; thereby to confirme the art of *Mental Reseruation* in an oath; which is as absurd a collection, as could have beene made, for in the oath, signified in this verse, we see a *swearing with the tongue*, and a *not swearing with the minde*, that is, the tongue is diuided and distracted from the minde; the tongue promising and saying [*I will give thee this*] the mind denying and gain saying thus [*I will not give thee this*], which in Christianity cannot but be a maine lie, according vnto the vulgar description vsed by *S. Augustine*, *Mentiri est contra mentem ire: It is a lie, to goe against the minde*.

Aug. supra.

12. Shall wee compare the Equiuocators art in this? In *Cicero's* oath we see two propositions, the one is in the mouth; and affirmatiue, *I will doe this*; the other is in the minde and negatiue, *I will not doe this*; and in both there is a flat contradiction between the tongue and the minde, which is downright lying. But the Equiuocators are refined falsifiers, for that they may auoide the infamy of a lie, which must needs be in two contradictory propositions, they haue inuented a trick, to put two propositions in one, as thus; the mouth saying, *I will give thee it* (which he intendeth not to give, and supplieth in his mind) *but onely in conceit*, or such a like clause, which he shall fancy to himselfe. If therefore the Equiuocators will defend *Cicero* his reseruation, then must they professe flat lying, affirming with their mouth, that which they deny in their minde. But if they will maintaine only their *mixt proposition* by *Mental Reseruation*, they must seeke another Patron for it than *Cicero*; who neuer fancied

cied any such conceit. Norwithstanding *Cicero* is thus far more righteous than the men of this generation, for he admitted no vse of his maner of falshood, but against *Theenes*, *Pirates*, and such as were perfidious euen vnto humane society, liuing without the law of Nations: But our Equiuocators can professe and practise their art of delusion among Christians, yea and (as *M. Parsons* hath taught vs) in deceiuing our deere friendes. We passe now on to *M. Parsons* his Conclusion: for that which he obiekteth out of *Azorius* is but a twice or thrice sodden colwoort.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Truly when I reade it over together with many other points before mentioned, and doe consider how weighty matter of accusation they doe containe, and how much I doe insist vpon them, to make the deformity thereof appears in the Readers eyes, and those also of M. Morton, if it were possible, and thereby to draw from him either some sound answer, or a simple confession of his errours, so far as such they may be called: or rather of his witting fraude, to beguile his Reader, which were the best and truest forme of answer, if almighty God would giue him light to see the same (though I will presume that he sinned not wholly against his conscience therein, but framed rather his conscience so, as he might thinke it lawfull perhaps to streine truth, for helping such a cause as his is) yet I cannot but murrell, that he would passe ouer with silence all these grauer matters, and betake himselfe to slighter things in this his last Answer.

The Review.

13 What sound conscience can *M. Parsons* haue in himselfe, who iudgeth that any man can thinke he may lawfully in his conscience streine the truth? if *M. Parsons* measure vs by the footings of his owne kinde, who iustifie euill acts, that are done with good intentions, such as were they that called the lies of *Indulgences* *Godly deccits*, he

M. Parsons, by censuring other mens consciences, hath preiudiced his owne.

is deceived: he must be contented to enjoy the company of his owne fellowes, and not to range into other coasts for triall hereof, because among true Christians Truth will be as much ashamed to be supported with a lie, as an honest Matron will blush to bee attended vpon with an arrant strumpet.

14 As for my selfe, heere I set my hand, and by this my Answer, and in this the inward thought of my heart to witnesse (for a testimony betweene vs in that day) that I am perswaded that *Mentall Equiuocation* (as it is described and professed by *M. Parsons*, and practised by some of his fellowes) is a perfect lie, and that this *Syren* or *Mare-maide*, which is halfe woman, and halfe fish, I meane their *Mixt proposition*, which they will haue to be *part in the month*, and *part in the minde*, will neuer be prooued out of *Cicero*, or any Heathenish Author. Which point I insisted vpon in my *Full satisfaction*, but haue not receiued from *M. Parsons* the least shadow of satisfaction heereunto, out of the writing of any Heathen Philosopher, except only the now alleged sentences of *Cicero*, who, according to his owne confession, held a *false oath* to be lawful, which is more than our *Equiuocators* will seeme to dare to defend; and that which they defend *Cicero* (if he had heard of it) would haue called, a lie. And so I leaue it.

Mentall Equiuocation cannot possibly be prooued out of the Testimony of any Heathen.

SECT. II.

The one and twentieth charge. M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reck. pag. 462. **T**hat you may know that this number of 20. is not precise, but that many others may be added also, if a man will run ouer my said Treatise, I haue thought good to note moe. One is concerning *D. Barkley* a Scottish man. The first is that he relateth a certaine cholericke speech of the said *D. Barkley* used against an argument of *D. Boucher*, as though it had bene spoken against *Bellarmino*, whom it concerned not, &c. Which is a wilfull corruption.

The

The Review.

15 I should be very sorry but that *M. Parsons* might easily object more than a score, yea or twenty score accusations of this kinde, wherein in the Reader shall not finde my corruption, but his owne wilfull and slanderous crimination. For he that will but view the place, * shall not finde in the translation so much as mention of either *Bellarmino* or *Boucher*; ^{Full Satisfact. part. 3. p. 7} but I said onely that your *D. Barkley* calleth your assertion ^{M. Parsons' his fine trick of fraud.} most false: which in the margent I noted to be the assertion of *Bellarmino*, mentioned not in *Barkley*, but in the 3. cap. *Supra*, to wit, in the same booke of my *Full Satisfaction*, as it there plainly appeareth. Notwithstanding, if I had brought in *Barkley* to confute *Bellarmino* by name, *Barkley* himselfe would haue iustified me, who doth expressly and professedly write against * *Bellarmino* vpon the very same point, as I shal shew. ^{See a little better after,} Shall we leaue their persons, and speake of their Assertions?

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Nor indeed is *Bellarmino*'s maner of speech contrary to that which *Barkley* will haue to be the meaning of the History: ^{Reck. pag. 462.} for 463. that *Barkley* doth not so much stand vpon the things in controuerse for Priests authority, but vpon the maner of prooffe, by the examples alleaged by *D. Boucher*, of *Ieroboam*, *Ozias*, *Athalia*, and some other Princes, in whose punishment God vsed Priests for meanes and instruments. Non ignoro (saith he) ius esse Ecclesiz in Reges & Principes Christianos, nec quale ius sit ignoro, sed id tam alienis argumentis ostendi, prius ignoro: imò non ostendi planè scio. I am not ignorant (saith *D. Barkley*) that the church hath right ouer Christian Kings and Princes, nor am I ignorant what maner of right it is: yet doe I not see how the same may be prooued by such impertinent arguments; nay I know rather that it cannot be so prooued. Which words going but very few lines before those that T.M. alleageth,

he could not but see and yet left them out, and then beginneth against us his English text thus: Your owne Doctour calleth this your assertion most false, and contrary to the direct history of the Bible, to wit, That Ozias was deposed of his kingdome by Azarias the high Priest. And this is the first abuse, as to me it seemeth, inexcusable.

The Review.

M. Parsons
his malicious
falshood.

16 Nomaruell though you thinke this, or any other thing, *inexcusable*, that passeth from mee, whilst as you looke vpon it thorow your wonted spectacles of rancor and despight, otherwise you could not haue been so grossly overseene, as to thinke me heerin reprehensible at all, much lesse *inexcusable*: thereby bewraying your incredible malice, as by comparing the Authors sentences will be most cleere and euident.

^d Full Satisfact.
part. 3. pag. 4.

^e Ib. pag. 5.

Bellarmino fully
confuted
by Barkley.

^f Bellar. lib. 4.
de Pont. ca. 5.

^g Barkl. lib. 5.
contra Monar.
cho. cap. 11.

17 ^a Bellarmine his assertion was this: *King Ozias, for exercising the Priestly office, was deprived of his kingdome.* So he. This assertion ^b Barkley called False and contrary to the direct historie of the Bible, and ancient Interpreters, because it is manifest (saith hee) that Ozias died a King, and that his sonne, during his leprosie, was only Rector. Again, Bellarmine from the same example of Ozias, collected that ^c The high Priest had power to deprive the King of his kingdome. Contrariwise Barkley saith, that ^d It is most false to say that Ozias was deprived of his kingdome by the high Priest; saying and prouing, that it is either great indiscretion, or els impudencie, to affirme it, because it is confuted by most euident Scripture. Can there be a greater contradiction betweene East and West, true and false, than there is betweene these two opinions of Bellarmine and Barkley?

^e Barr. ib. lib.
3. cap. 15.

18 Notwithstanding, in M. Parsons his seeming, Barkley, his oddes is not so great. And why, I pray you, M. Parsons? ^f Because Barkley doth acknowledge a maner of right in the Church ouer Kings. What a wilfull intoxication is this? We speake of the power continue of deposing of Kings, which Barkley

Barkley denieth to be iustificable : *M. Parsons* opposeth *Barkleys* confession of a spirituall power of excommunication. Nay, I say yet more : *Barkley* was so far from agreeing with *Bellarmino* in this point, that he writ a large Chapter against him by name, to confute his many rebellious positions made against the authority of Kings; and among others he doth particularly answer this his obiection concerning *Oziab*, ¹ *I haue shewen (saith he) that this is most false.* And now I leaue this fraud of *M. Parsons* to be named by himselfe, presuming that he that called my true Allegation *inexcusable*, will not want a proper Epithet best befitting his owne guiltinesse.

¹ *Barcla, de potestate Papa. c. 37.*

SECT. III.

The summe of the two and twentieth charge.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

THe second is about an authority of *S. Ambrose*, craftily cut off from the speech of the said *D. Barkley* by *M. Morton*, ^{Reck. pag. 463.} ^{464.} whereof my accusation in my former Treatise was this, viz. But yet if I would examine (quoth I) the particular authorities that be alleaged about this matter, though nothing making against us, as hath beene said, and consider how many false shifts are used by *T. M.* therein, you would say that he were a Doctor indeed in that science, for that a few all Treatise will scarce containe them. I will touch one for example sake. He citeth *D. Barkley*, bringing in the authority of *S. Ambrose*, that he resisted not by force his *Arrian* Emperour, when he would take a Church from him for the *Arrians* : but he setteth not downe what answer his Doctor *Barkley* doth alleage in the very same place, which is, *Allegatur Imperatori licere omnia, &c.* It is alleaged, that it is lawfull for the Emperour to doe all things, for that all things are his (and consequently that he may assigne a Church unto the *Arrians*.) Where to I answer (saith *S. Ambrose*) Trouble not your selfe, O Emperour, nor thinke that you haue Imperiall right over those things that are Diuine. Doe not exalt your selfe, but if you will raigne long, be subiect vnto God : for it is written that those things

^{Amb. l. 3. c. 33}

things that belong to God, must be given to God: and to Cæsar onely those things that belong to Cæsar. Palaces appertaine to the Emperour, but Churches to the Priest. Theright of defending publike walles is committed to you, but not of sacred things. Thus D. Barkley out of S. Ambrose in the very place cited by T. M. which he thought good wholly to pretermitt and cut off, and yet to make a flourish, as though D. Barkley had cited S. Ambrose to proove that the temporal Prince and Emperour was in no case, nor in any cause spirituall or temporall to be withstood, or resisted. And what will yee say of this manner of dealing? Out of what conscience may it proceed?

The Renew.

19 Surely, either my answer proceeded out of a better conscience, than that which M. Parsons bewraieth in this accusation, or else I must confesse it is a blacke and vgly conscience indeed. For the matter in question being this,

¹ Full Satisfact. *Whether it be lawfull for Catholikes to raise tumults against Hereticall Magistrates, euen when they haue force to resist,*

^{part. 3. pag. 24.} *which is the now generall doctrine of Romish writers (as there appeared) I, for confutation heereof, alleaged Barkley, who writeth thus of S. Ambrose. ¹ S. Ambrose (saith he)*

¹ *Barcla. lib. 3. was sufficiently armed both by the power of the people, and soldiers, and strengthened by the might of Christ, yet would he not defend his Church with violence, no nor against the furie of an Hereticall Emperour. The whole question being not of resisting by disobedience, which is not obeying a wicked command, but of resisting by violence, by bearing armes against*

^{M. Parsons} *his person. This causeth me to wonder at the palenelle of M. Parsons his face, who bluseth not to insist in that example and Author, wherein both he and all his Complices, who like Herald's proclaime Armes and violence against the ma-*

^{Our Romish} *iesty of Kings, to depose them, are so literally, so largely, and so really confounded. For thus it followeth in Barkley: Ambrose doth so handle the matter (saith he) that he neither be-*

^{Aduersaries} *traieth Gods cause, nor yet violateth the Maiesty of his Prince:*

^{fully confuted} *by their owne*

^{Barkley.} *he*

he resisted by not doing that which the wicked King did command: yet he obiedly suffering patiently that which was decreed in the Emperours Edict: Ambrose would not excite any to armes, not because he could not, but because he ought not, as he himselfe did confesse. And in the shutting vp of the point: These haue I therefore written (saith Barkley) to shut vp the mouthes of such, who say that the ancient Church did tollerato euil Princes, because at that time they were not of sufficient power to resist, and abstained onely untill they might finde strength to resist.

20 Which confession of Barkley may serue for a muzzle for Alan, Rainolds, Coster, Creswell, Bellarmine, Symancha, and my good friend M. Parsons, who doe generally professe a violent resistance of them, whom they call Hereticall Kings, as soone as they may presume of their owne force. Norwithstanding, M. Parsons his Conscience could dispense with himselfe to perswade vs that nothing in this part of Barkley maketh against them, when as (wherein I dare appeale vnto any Reader of what profession soeuer) neither M. Parsons, nor any Iesuit can haue a greater Adversary in this cause, not onely in that place, but euen throughout that whole booke.

CHAP. V.

Containing an Answer to the last charge of an heape of Falshoods at once.

§. I.

I He Question was, whether our Aduersaries ^{¶ Ful Satisfact.} doe offer greater indignity vnto Kings, than ^{part. 1.} vnto Popes, by their Doctrine of *Deposing of Heretikes*. The Moderate Answerer held that they *Do not*: I went diameter, and affirmed that *They doe* offer more preiudice vnto Kings, because

cause they teach that Kings, when they command obedience vnto Doctrines, as *Kings*, they may become Heretikes, and thereby they are made by them liable vnto the censure of deposing. But for *Popes*, they resolute otherwise, to wit, That *Popes*, as *Popes*, can not be Heretikes: and they vnderstand, that a *Pope* then speaketh as a *Pope*, whensoever he determineth any doctrine to be a truth, and propoundeth it to be beleueed of Christians, whether he define so in a Councell, or ^b Alone without a Councell. Whereupon I inferred this mine owne Consequence (as the Characters should haue distinguished) that by this doctrine, A *Pope* cannot be deposed; and so their disparity betweene *Kings* and *Popes*, is easily euicted.

^b *Gregorius Ios. Colloq. Rariab. S. ff. 1. Siue solus aliquid definiat, est eius infallibilis authoritas: cum e Cathedra vt Pontifex definit, non est erroris obnoxius.*

2 The Antecedent, viz. *Popes as Popes cannot be Heretikes*, I vnderooke to prooue to be the Romish Tenet, from the confession of *Bellarmino*, *Greg. Valentia*, *Salmeron*, *Canus*, *Stapleton*, and *Costerus*. And now *M. Parsons* is desirous to be heard speake, this being his last Charge: He hath rammed his peece full, and shooteth haile-shot, pretending, that in these Allegations, I haue committed Ten Falshoods.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

^c *Reckon. p. 467.*

^c He citeth other foure or fise Authors in the Margent, to wit, *Greg. Valentia*, &c. all which in the very places by him cited are expressly against him. And is not this strange dealing? Let *Canus*, that goeth in the middelt, speake for all the fise, *Who*, &c.

The Reniew.

3 Not so *M. Parsons*: for albeit I shal not refuse to heare *Canus* speake, yet is there no reason that he should be therefore the spokel-man for the rest, because he is in the *Middelt*. You are too prone to imitate the Spirits which were called *Ventriloquis*, and spake out of the bellies of parties. But both the Rules of Art in discoursing, and the law of Conscience in accusing, do challenge you rather to begin at the beginning.

ginning. I may not suffer you to be irregular. I affirmed that it was the Doctrine of your fore-cited Authors, to professe that *Popes, as Popes, cannot be Heretikes*. Vpon this Antecedent I built this Consequence, that by the same doctrine it must necessarily follow, that then *As Popes they cannot be deposed for Heresie*. What will you *M. Parsons*, say vnto the Antecedent? What is that which you will now conclude from *Canus*?

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

That Popes may be Heretikes, as Popes, and consequently Reck. pag. 467. may be deposed.

The Review.

4 If the foresaid Authors do affirme that *Popes, as Popes, may be Heretikes*, nay, if they do not absolutely deny it euen in the very same places which I haue alleaged, then let your brand of *Impudency* stick fast in my forehead. First, *Bellarmino*. ^a *The opinion of them (saith he) who say that the Pope, as Pope, may be an Heretike; and teach an Heresie, est opinio erronea, & heresi proxima: that is, Is an erroneous opinion, and next vnto Heresie.* Yea, he is so far from yeelding to *M. Parsons*, that in his sixth Chapter he saith: *Piū credendum, &c.* that *It is piously to be beleued, that the Pope cannot be an Heretike, not onely as he is Pope, but euen as he is a private man, by beleueing obstinately any thing that is contrary vnto faith.* And ^b *Cacerius* doth follow *Bellarmino* verbatim, yea Syllabatum, saying, *Opinio est erronea &c.* and *Piū credendum, &c.* concluding that *A Pope, as Pope, cannot be an Heretike*. Seeing then that *Bellarmino* doth confute *M. Parsons* euen in terminis, it is not to be maruelled, that *M. Parsons* chose rather *Canus* than *Bellarmino*, to speake for all the rest.

5 The second is *Greg. de Valentia*, who is most peremptory in this point. ^c *They that shall say (saith he) that the Pope*

^a Bellar. l. 4. de Rom. Pont. c. 2. S. Secunda opinio, & S. ex his.

^b M. Parsons maruelous ignorance or puerfulness, in reporting the iudgement of his owne Authors.

^c Ibid. sup. 6. ^d Carrer. lib. 2. de Rom. Pont. c. 23.

^e Valent. l. 1. c. 3. S. Respondeo quid.

can according to his publike person (that is, as Pope) erre in faith, in things controuerted in the Church, those men doe most grievously erre in faith. Salmeron defendeth the same position, calling this the ¹ Singular prerogative of the Pope, that as Pope he cannot erre in determining any thing against faith. Stapleton walketh in the same path. ¹ The Pope (saith he) as a private man, may erre, but in discharging his function (that is, as Pope) he cannot erre in the matters of faith. Costerus will not be behinde his fellowes. ¹ We doe constantly deny (saith he) that the Popes of Rome can teach (that is, as Popes) others an heresie. Only Canus remaineth, whom M. Parsons would haue to *speak for the rest*. In good time: for he will not be found differing from the rest. ¹ The Pope of Rome saith Canus) cannot erre in defining Controuersies of faith: which is all one as to say, that although the Pope may fall into heresie, as he is a private man, yet as he doth prescribe any doctrine to be publicly beleued in the Church (that is, as Pope) he cannot be an heretike. And thus the Antecedent is cleerely ratified by all the *five* witnesses, whom I alleged. I proceed now to the Consequence.

The Consequence.

6. The Argument standeth thus: He that can not be an heretike, as Pope, can not as Pope be deposed for an heresie. But the Pope of Rome (according to the doctrine of the former witnesses) can not be an heretike, as Pope. Ergo, As Pope (according to their principles) he can not be deposed for heresie. M. Parsons opposeth heerunto as followeth.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

¹ Reckon. pag. 446.

¹ The foure witnesses by him mentioned, to wit, Bellarmine, Carerius, Azorius, and Gratian doe expressly holde, that Popes both may fall into heresies, and may also be deposed for the same, by the Church. And their words are guilefully alleged by T. M. as sounding to the contrary; and are spoken of matters only, and not of faith.

The

The Review.

7 Doth this Assertion, *Popes may be heretikes*, contradict the former, *Popes as Popes cannot be heretikes*? Is not this an excellent fallacie? Good *M. Parsons* remember your owne rules: *A Priest having a secrecie, as Priest (that is, in Confession) may not reveale it: but hearing a secret; as not Priest, but as a private man (that is, out of Confession) bee* *M. Parsons notable guile & falsehood.* *may sometime lawfully discover it.* Were it not a fond cauill for any to say, that the first, *A Priest as Priest may not reveale a secret*, is a lie, because the other is a truth. *vz. Hearing it as no Priest, he may reveale it?* Have you not yet learned to distinguish of the two kinde of persons in the *Pope*, as well as in a *Priest*? the one *publike*, as *Pope*, the other *private*, as a particular Doctor? Neuerthelesse, although all my dispute was concerning the *publike* person of the *Pope*, to proue that by their doctrine the *Pope as Pope cannot be an heretike*, yet shall I be contented to step a little neerer vnto *M. Parsons* his apprehension, and to examine what their doctrine is concerning the *Pope*, as he is a *private* Doctor, especially in these two points: the first is his fault, *vz. heresie*; the second his punishment, which is, *to be deposed*. Of the first thus.

Whether *Bellarmino* hold simply, that any *Pope*
can be an heretike.

§. II.

8 I leaue the former respect of *Pope as Pope*, &c. the cleerenesse whereof was such in *Bellarmino*, lib. 4. de Rom. Pont. that it may seeme to haue dazled *M. Parsons* his braines, inso much that he started backe from that place alleged, and recoiled vnto *Bellarmino* his second Book de Pontifice, seeking there some matter of obiection against me.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

* *Bellarmino* confesseth out of *Gratian* Can. Si Papa. Dist. 40. that an hereticall *Pope* may be iudged & deposed; and more, *Reckon. pag. 466.*
that

Bellar. l. 2. de
Pont. c. 30.

that in the 8. generall Councell Sess. 7. Pope Honorius was de-
posed for heresie.

The Review.

M. Parsons his
cunning.

• Bellar. l. 2.
de Pont. c. 30.
* See above
lis. e.

† Bellar. l. 4.
de Rom. Pont.
cap. 7.

A strange
mysterie.

Pope Honorius
iudged an he-
retike by a
Councell.

† Bellar. l. 4.
de Rom. Pont.
c. 11.

A similitude
discouering
a Romish
mysterie.

9 Doth then Bellarmine speake this vpon his certaine beleeve, that either a Pope can be an heretike, or els that Honorius was truly deposed for heresie? Both which, M. Parsons, as it seemeth, would make vs beleeue. But Bellarmine in the same place saith, that it is * probable, and easily to be defended (which he before held to be * piously belconed) to wit, that a Pope cannot be an heretike. And elſewhere more exactly answering vnto an obiection taken out of the foresaid Can. Si Papa, which was this, † Seeing that that and other Canons teach that the Pope cannot be iudged, except he be found to erre in faith; Ergo, the Pope may erre in faith, or otherwise such Canons should be in vaine: hee vseth two answers, but as though the first were too feeble; Secondly, I say (saith hee) that such Canons doe not meane that a Pope may erre, euen as he is a private person, but only that the Pope cannot be iudged. And because it is not altogether certaine, whether the Pope may be an heretike or no, therefore, for more cauteiousnesse, they added that clause, Nisi hæreticus extiterit, that is, except he be an heretike. By this it appeareth that Bellarmine will not thinke, that any Pope can be an heretike, either as he is Pope, or as he is a private man.

10 Concerning Honorius, Bellarmine in the clause of the same sentence, which M. Parsons hath alleaged, held it for probable, that Honorius was not an heretike: in whose defence he bestoweth a large Chapter, wherein he is so bolde as to say, that the foresaid † Councell was deceived, in iudging that Honorius was guiltie of heresie. Could M. Parsons be ignorant of this?

11 By this time wee may discover a strange mysterie of strong delusion, which I shall first shew in a mirror. Camby-
ses King of Persia, being so farre transported with vnnaturall lust, as to desire to marrie his owne sister, demanded first of his Councillers, whether such a match were warrantable by the

the law of the *Persians* ? they return him this answer : There is no Persian law which will allow you such a marriage, but yet we finde (say they) a law which doth licence the King of *Persia* to doe what he list. So some Romish Authours likewise, although they say that a *Pope being an heretike may be deposed*, yet haue they also taught, that the *Pope can not be an heretike* : which is all one as to thinke that, as *Pope*, he may not be iudged an heretike, and if not iudged, then how shall he be deposed : For if hee shall happen to teach an heresie, (seeing that we may not beleue that he can be an heretik) let him teach what he list, he may not be suspected of heresie, if not suspected, then not iudged, or condemned, and then consequently not deposed for heresie, which is our maine Consequence. And for a further confutation I adde as followeth.

That their position, concerning *Deposing a Pope* is but a cunning delusion.

§. III.

12 *Bellarmino* doth consider two capacities in the *Pope*, the first is in respect of his *Temporall Principedome*, the other in respect of his *Spirituall Pastourship and Popedom*. Concerning his *Temporall state*, *The Pope as other Princes* (saith *Bellarmino*) may acknowledge no *superiour in Temporall matters* : but in examining the *Spirituall iurisdiction*, we say (saith he, answering in the name of himself) *that the Pope cannot be iudged upon earth by any Prince Christian, whether he be Temporall or Ecclesiasticall, no nor yet by all assembled together in a generall Conncell*: meaning, that he can not be deposed *coactively*. Be it that this is spoken in respect of matter of fact, and not of faith, yet when (supposing that a *Pope may be an heretike*) we shall demand how a *Pope* may be deposed, what will our Aduersaries answer ? For either must the *Pope* relinquish his *Popedom*, together with his *Temporall Principedome* *voluntarily*, or els by violence : but not voluntarily, because *Obstinacie* (that iron sinew) *being above*.

A Dilemma. *a* *properties of heresie*, the Pope will not voluntarily remoue, especially, out of so rich a Chaire. Neither may he be removed violently and by coactive force; For what Romish Author will iustifie violence in deposing a Pope by any example? and yet diuers *Popes* haue been heretikes, yea euen as *Popes*.

Alphonſus de Castro, lib. 1. heres. cap. 4. & cap. 2.

13 From these premises our Christian Reader may vnderstand, first the truth of my former assertion, to wit, that the Romish Doctors beleue that *The Pope, as Pope, cannot be an heretike*. Secondly, the vanity of *M. Parsons* his objection, *that being heretikes they may be deposed*, seeing that they must not beleue that any Pope can be a pertinacious heretike. Thirdly, the necessitie of my consequence, *vz. They that hold that the Pope cannot be an heretike, must grant that he can not be deposed for heresie*. And lastly, the disparitie betweene the state of *Kings* and *Popes*, issuing from the former considerations, because thus *Kings* shall (by this doctrine) be deposed for heresie, but *Popes* may not. And what a *gulf*, and gulfe of difference do they furthermore make betweene these two states, whilst as they iustifie the examples of diuers *Popes*, in deposing of many Emperours not for heresie, but for other causes, and yet denie that the Pope may be deposed, *Although he should do any thing preiudiciall to the vniuersall state of the Church*, as their *Carerius* taught: or *Although* (as their leſuite *Azorius* spake) *hee should neglect Ecclesiasticall Canons, and pervert the lawes of Kings*; or *Although* (as it is in *Gratian*) *he should carie inſince multitude of ſoules headlong with him into a bell*. And now wee see the height of Papall prerogatiue, and therein the depth of Antichristian tyrannie.

Carerius lib. de poſſ. Pont. li. cap. 24. & Azor. Ies. Inſtit. Moral. l. 5 c. 14 §. Sed certe. & Diff. 40. Can. Si Papa.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

Containing a briefe Censure upon a late little Pamphlet,
intituled,

A PATERNE OF A PROTESTANT;
which was written by a namelesse
Libeller.

I T is now almost foure yeeres since my Booke
of *Ful Satisfaction* was published in answer
vnto the *Moderate Answer*: in all which
time I heard nothing of this fellow, who
Endymion-like seemed vnto mee to haue
slept a drowisie sleepe; yet now at length hee beginneth to
rowze himselfe; and to tell vs his dreame of a *Patrone* of a
Protestant; or as though some man had serued a *Latine* vp-
on him, because he had formerly betraied his Romish cause: The Pam-
phletter his
Latinar.
Therefore he holding it a shame at least not to saie some-
thing, he commeth in clamorously with a scurrilous libell,
which the wise Reader will discerne to haue been penned ra-
ther for the vexation of his aduersary, than in any hope of
the reparation of his broken cause. To whom first I make
this answer, viz. that I owe him no answer.

That there is no Answer due vnto this namelesse
libeller, euen by the doctrine of the Ro-
manists themselves.

§. I.

2 Cardinal Bellarmine censuring a *Venetian Doctor*, who printed a booke, without prefixing his name *ad Libellum* in
before it, telleth him that *The Councell of Trent Sess. 4.* doth scriptum, Res-
exact, vpon paine of excommunication, that no bookes concerning *penis Doctoris*
Diuine matters be printed without the *Authors name*, and the *Theologi ad*
Approbationes of the Ordinary both set downe in the title page of scriptum. &c.
the booke. But this Libeller doth not afford vs so much as *in principia*,

Kk 2

the

*h Bellar. lib. 4.
de Rom Pont. c.
13. §. Iohan-
nes.*

the least letter of his name, and therefore ought he first to seeke an absolution for his contempt against their Churches order before that he can iustly expect of me an Answer to his calumnious Pamphlet. Again, the same Cardinall himselfe noteth that *Author sine nomine est sine autoritate*, that is, *An Author without a name is without authority*: by which reason I am licenced to dismiss this railing and scolding libeller, as a man (if yet he be a man and not a woman) of no credit. Neuerthelesse, seeing that this Cypher will stand for a digit and be thought to be some-body, I will answer something to him; lest I may seeme to contemne him: yet not much, lest any may thinke that I do greatly respect him; but especially lest that by but repeating his lawish language, and frivolous exceptions, I might abuse both my Readers patience, and mine owne more serious intentions.

Onely I craue his licence, that I may give him some tribute, because otherwise I shal seeme to dispute with the man in the moone. And what can be more proper vnto him than *Mr. Pamphleter* or *Libeller*? Of whom I would first know what esteeme he is off.

The Pamphleter.

Page 62.

*A rare patern
of singular ar-
rogancy in
this Pamphle-
ter.*

In a booke called the Moderate Answer made an offer of a publike triall at the time of the Conuocation and Parliament, and the greatest assembly of Protestant Bishops and Doctors, and to them all: And I hope, Mr. Doctor, that you did not with discretion say that my selfe, who made this offer, and was one of them that was assigned to be one of the three Catholike Disputants to performe it against you all, either feared scratching or biting of you, or your best biting dogges.

The Censure.

3 I crie the man mercy, I tooke him for an infamous and senselesse libeller, but I perceiue by the testimony which he beareth of himselfe, that he is a famous and learned Challenger,

ger, one assigned among the three Worthies to dispute with all *Bishops* and *Doctors* of our profession. But when we would know who this worthy *Disputer* is, and where we may finde him, his name is *Nemo*, & his aboad is *Nusquam*, who (if we shall not trust him) will never deceiue vs. We haue heard of his authority, shall we heare something of his honesty?

The Pamphleter.

Because I will not accuse another in mine owne guiltinesse, I must trie whether he could obiect any thing against me: He being charged by a Catholike Author to challenge, if he could, any one Catholike Writer of falsification; although I was then fresh in his memory, yet he left me out of his Reply.

The Censure.

4 The Challenge which *M. Parsons* made was that I should note but any one man of that profession, who might be found guilty of falshoods, by wilful abuse of his Authors. I therefore for my Aduersaries better satisfaction thought to single out *Bellarmin*, one of the tallest Firre-trees of their *Libanon*, which so overshadowed this Pamphleter that I could not see him; and now the shrub boasts that hee (forsooth) was therefore freed from all taxation of false dealing. Could this be one of the *Three select Disputants*, that argueth so absurdly? Before I end this Censure, he will know that it was not the syncerity of his dealing, but the obscurity of his place and person that made me omit him in that Reply: as may appeare both by his present vnconscionable challenge of me, and also from his former dissolute and immoderate Answer vnto the booke of *Discovery*. In his present Pamphlet he signifieth first what he will not, and then what he will doe. Of the first.

The Pamphleter.

*I will omit all things, whereof he hath bene by others admo-
nished, intending onely to take the leanings of his Romane Ad-*

nerfary (meaning, M. Parsons) and not to burden M. Morton with any thing that he chargeth him withall.

The Censure.

SECT. II.

The first fruits
of the Pam-
phleters fall-
shoods.

5 I thought at the first that the libeller had beene *M. Parsons* his Page, but now I perceiue he is but his Gleaner, whom indeed he followeth at the very heeles, and sometime (by his leaue) he lurcheth out of his sheaffe: for he beginneth his charge with manifest fallhoods, and flatly contrary to his promise he vrgeth (*Pag. 37. & 38.*) my sentence concerning the *Nature of Heresie*, which was obiected by *M. Parsons*. Secondly (*pag. 14.*) of the *Not satisfiing of his Obiections*: Thirdly (*pag. 28. 29. 30.*) he excepteth against the saying, *That all Popish Priests hold that doctrine of Rebellion*: Fourthly (*Pag. 12.*) he reprooueth that *awrd*; all which were obiected by *M. Parsons*, and haue beene already answered in this Reckoning. It is likely that the Pamphleter will deale iustly with me, who thus grossly falsifieth his own absolute promise? We haue heard what he would *not doe*, (although he doth it.) In the next place let vs see what he intendeth to do although he can not do it, namely, to charge me with falsities; and this he indeuoureth to performe both by the testimonies of others, and by his owne demonstrations. Of the first as followeth.

The Pamphleter.

*Pag. 6. & pag.
19. & 13. 14.*

His owne Brethren in religion haue charged him with abuse of authorities, which he hath committed in his booke against me; euen the Consenters vnto the booke intiuuled, A Christian and modest offer of a most indifferent Conference; who giue this censure against him, saying that the matter is pitifully shifted off.

The Censure.

6 In the *Full Satisfact. pag. 105.* my words were these,
concer-

concerning the Kings Maiesties censure of an Annotation vpon 2. *Chro.* 15. 16. His Maiestie (said I) being so diuinely illuminated, could not take exception to the note, for any offence thereby given, but only in suspicion and ieaλονzie of some offence, which by some weake ones was taken thereby. This is the point, wherein I dare appeale vnto any Reader to iudge whether either the Libeller could call this a fallhood; or that other Offerer of a conference, (whose humor was crossed in that answer) call it a pitifull shifting, wherein notwithstanding they noted no falsification. Yet the Pamphleter is not content to obiekt this (such is his rankor) once or twice, but often doth he inculcate it, that thereby he might interest me in his own propertie of wilfull fallhood. Beside this testimonie, he insisteth vpon demonstrations: some are generall, and others are particular. First of the generall.

His fraudulentie.

The Pamphleter.

I had in my booke 2000 lines, and M. Doctor made shew to pag. 18. 19. cite my very words, and wholly; yet doth not so much as mention 400. How then could he call it a Full Satisfaction?

The Censure.

SECT. III.

7. *Pauperis est numerare pecus.* What a fond Pamphleter is this, who reckoneth the number of the lines of his whole booke: it had been well he had as willingly reckoned his lies, who saith vntruly, that I pretended to cite all the words of his booke. No, for I thought it a sin for me to report all his lawless, scurril, & brawling terms; or els to repeat all his idle & tedious repetitions, who now (to the end that he might be as fond as he hath been false) would haue his Reader thinke that there can not be a Full Satisfaction given to a mans booke, except all the lines thereof be wholly cited. Whereby he can not but condemne his father M. Parsons in his answering of the same Full Satisfaction; but much more

His idle and miserable taxation.

his

his L. Cardinall *Bellarmino*, who in his Answer vnto his Ma-
iesties *Apologie* did not cite, as I am perswaded, 2000 lines,
yea and his owne distressed and distorted answer vnto the
little *Disconerie of Romish positions*. Who would trouble him-
selfe with such babisme as this Pamphleter vscth? Passe we
from generals, and let vs trie him in some particulars. The
first.

The Pamphleter.

Page. 10. & 11. The Doctor answered, that enquiring into the Acts which
are extant concerning the proceedings of King Henrie 8. against
Q. Mary, and Q. Elizabeth, he found not any act whereby, after
that they had been disabled, they were restored vnto the right of
successton: wherein he is confuted by Bish. Barlow, who excu-
seth the first disinheriting of them, and sheweth the legitimisation
of them againe.

The Censure.

SECT. IV.

8 In the end of the same booke of *Full Satisfaction*, I
expressed as much my selfe in a particular Aduertisement
vnto the Reader in this behalfe, which hath been published
now these three yeres, wherein I satisfied for the integritie
both of my cause and conscience: yet notwithstanding this
their choise *Disputer* and *Moderate Answerer*, or rather their
immoderate Pamphleter, durst obiect this corrected errour
vnto me, which he hath also singled out, and set in the first
place, for the most notoriously blacke note of *falsehood*. This
kinde of dealing I finde dayly among the Romanists: I
might finde more ingenuitie among the Pagans. As for B.
Barlow, he doth not so much as point at me.

The Pamphleter.

Enter againe, M. Doctor, and excuse your selfe, if you can,
why the very first chapter being intituled, *A generall censure of
his slanderous Pamphlet*, prouing that no argument therein can
conclude

conclude the Author's intent, is omitted without any mention at all! Tell me, was this integrity?

The Censure.

9 I now enter, Sir Phamphileter, to your blush, if you be not past shame, giving you to vnderstand that both your fourth and last Arguments are mentioned and satisfied expressly in the same *Full Satisf. part. 2. pag. 97. & 99.* As for the rest, they were more general insinuations, and were afterwards confuted in the answers vnto other particulars.

The Pamphleter.

At the first beginning he misquotheth the place of my Answer, Page 43, citing the second section, where there is no such thing, as he setteth of the consequence, Full Satisfact. pag. 1.

The Censure.

10 The quotation is in the margin of the *Full Smiths*.
 pag. 1. and is taken out of the booke of the *Moderate Answer* His shameles
 rer cap. 2. §. *Wherefore*. And if I have mis-cited him, let my vntruth,
 Reader suspect me in his other taxations; but if I have dealt
 expressly and directly therein; then may we quote this fel-
 low for a looke and leade calumniator.

The Pamphlet.

He citeth me disputing against the naked proposition [*All Pa. 33. & 34.* Protestants are, in the confesse of Catholics, heretikes and incommunicate.] absolutely concealing of what heretikes we instructed, whether they were denounced, or not denounced.

The Censure.

11 This likewise is a godlesse vntruth, for to bliew what His godlesse
3d T L1 kinde vntruth.

kinde of Heretike was understood, I spent professedly a whole chapter, vz. *Full Satisfact.* lib. 1. cap. 4. pag. 5.

The Pamphleter.

Pag. 35.

He charges me to say that [Not any Protestant is iudged by vs an Heretike] where the restriction [any] is his owne corruption, and maketh the same particular, which was general.

Mod. Answ.

cap. 2. §. For

first.

His babish

fallacie.

The Censure. 12 The Pamphleter's words were these: '[Not one Protestant, &c.] marke, Not one, and Not any: Can this choise Disputer finde any ods betwene these two? I wonder what he meaneth by this. Must I be at paines to teach a puppet to speake English?

The Pamphleter.

Pag. 35.

He intitled his 2. Chap. (of *Full Satisfact.*) thus, [Containing five arguments of the Moderate Answerer] but why in true dealing contained it not eight?

Mod. Answ.

cap. 2. §. For

first.

His babish

fallacie.

The Censure. 13 As though I had answered but five of those Arguments. If the Libeller had but named out the leaves following, he might have seene (*Full Satisfact.* cap. 4. pag. 5.) this Sixth and Seventh Arguments, both directly expressed, and also largely answered, the whole Chapter being spent only in the Confutation of these two Arguments. Could either I have dealt more justly with him, or be more false with me?

Notable
fallacie.

Oh, but where is the Right? Yea, marrie, this would be knowne; for in his booke there the Seventh is the last: therefore hee complaineth of his Printer, that set downe the sixth twice. I say, that if his Printer did it wittingly, he was wiser than the Pamphleter, because both they do consonantly imple one argument.

The

The Pamphleter.

And in these citations you further behaue your selfe with *Par. 36.*
 this sincerity, M. D. first, you cite my Answer to be in these
 words: No man doubting in faith, but onely such as be ob-
 stinate: No ignorant beleuer, or-deceined of Heretikes,
 but he to whom the truth hath beene made knowen: nor
 onely internally affected, but he that is a manifest Professor
 is subiect to the censure of excommunication for Heresie.
 Now sir, I must tell you, that there is not any such proposition in
 the places you cite from my Answer, as is manifest in my An-
 swer, &c.

The Censure.

14 What you haue pointed at in the Margent, suffer me
 to draw into a more particular view. The Propositions of
 the Pamphleter are contained in the *Moder. Answer. cap. 2.* A multiplicity
 my Citations in the *Full Satisfact. cap. 2.* His propositions of his vn-
 stand thus: Ignorance euen vincible excuseth from heresie: truths.
 And, The ignorantly-seduced Protestant is not an Heretike, ex-
 cept, when the truth of the Catholike doctrine is made manifest,
 he resist: And againe, He is not properly an Heretike, who is de-
 ceined of Heretikes, and beleueth Heretikes. The second,
 Both sufficient knowledge of truth proposed, and an obstinate per-
 tinacy in not imbracing it, with such defence of the contrary is re-
 quired in Heresie. The third, He that desireth to be ignorant
 of the truth, and so professeth Heresie in ignorance (though ther-
 in he sinne grievously) yet is he not an Heretike. The fourth A
 man doubting in his faith is not properly an Heretike. The fift,
 All Heretikes (as internall) be not subiect to the censure of ex-
 communication.

15 And what haue I now abstracted from these, to shew
 what kind of men are not subiect to the censure of excommuni-
 cation, in the opinion of the Pamphleter? First, that No man
 doubting in faith, &c. is his fourth: Secondly, Only such as be

obstinate, &c. which is his second : Thirdly, No ignorant beleuer, &c. which is his first and third : Fourthly, None deceived of Heretikes, but he to whom the truth is made known; which is also in his first : Fifthly, None onely internally infected, but he that is a manifest Professor, is subiect vnto the censure of excommunication, which agreeth with his fifth. And now I leaue the scanning of these to the sight, not (as he saith) of *All* (for who almost will vouchsafe the sight of such triflings) but of any, who shall cast his eie heereupon, to iudge whether there hath beene in my Citation the least note of *Insincerity*.

The Pamphleter.

Pag. 40.

My Proposition was onely this, [No Protestant or Heretike not excommunicate by name lieth subiect vnto any penalty pretended,] when as my sincerely dealing Aduersary (as before) citeth me to say, that such, are not subiect to any Penalties at all: which is his corruption, and not my proposition.

The Censure.

His quarrelous
veine of tra-
ducing his
Aduersary.

16 This will be soone tried, for in the *Full Satisf. cap. 4. pag. 5.* I deliuered his proposition thus : *No Protestant or Heretike, not excommunicate by name, lieth subiect to any penalty pretended.* What shadow then had this insincerely dealing Libeller thus to traduce me, as though I had falsified in this Citation? Who againe is so dull, as not to vnderstand, that seeing all kinde of outward penalties were implied in those which were pretended, it must needs follow that he that is not subiect vnto the pretended penalties, is not subiect to any at all.

The Pamphleter.

Pag. 40.

I said that no Protestant in England is excommunicate by name; which word (In England) for which our Controuersie was, he leaueth out.

The

The Censure.

17 This is as easily tried as the former : for (*Full Satisf.* cap. 4. pag. 5.) I repeated the Pamphleters sentence expressly thus : *No Protestant or Heretike not excommunicate by name* His palpable (as none in England is) lieth subiect, &c. I locked vp the falsitie. word, *England*, within the closet of a Parenthesis, lest it might not be seene ; and yet hee blusheth not to say , that I haue left it out. What shall we iudge of the temper of this fellow, who being in England can not see *England*?

The Pamphleter.

He ingeminates this sentence, [Protestants are no Heretikes,] Pag. 42. when as I neuer spake or thought any such absolute assertion.

The Censure.

18 We shall need no more but to set downe the words: The obiection in my Discouerie was this : *They who by your slanderous doctrine make all Protestants, in your opinion Heretikes, so odious, as unworthy of ciuill society, &c. the Pamphleter made this answer : " No learned Catholike so reputeth the Protestants, or any one Protestant in this kingdomes. But he saith that this was not to grant absolutely, that no Protestant was* His quarrel a. an *Heretike* : Very good, I then perceiue his meaning is, that bout his own he granted it not *absolutely*, but *equivocatingly*. Well, let him ambiguitie. enioy his arte, for me ; I enuie him not, although this be the best faculcie that he hath.

The Pamphleter.

You said that our generall assumption was this, that [All Pro. Pag. 43. testants are heretiks & excommunicate ;] but must needs grant that this citation is false, because the word, Generall, you know, comprehendeth all, and excludeth none.

The Censure.

His ignorance
of his common
Grammar
rules.

19 Good Reader, I pray thee do not laugh at the Pamphleter, nor send him backe to his English Rules, where thou hast red, that *There be excepted from this generall Rule as followeth.* But this noble *Disputant*, forsooth, calleth the generall Assumption false, which can admit any exception at all.

¶ Pag. 34.

20 I should proceed to censure ¹ his difference betweene these words, *Heretike and Excommunicate*, and *Heretike or Excommunicate*, and to confute it by their *Bulla cana*; and then to shew how inconsiderately he vpbraideth vs with the sentence of a kinsman of his owne, (as we may guesse by his name, but more by his distemper) euen *M. Broughton*; because that passionate man did condemne their vulgar translation farre more; and lastly, his loose Argument to proue the *Heresie of Arrianisme*, out of *ambrosius*, seeing that *Bellarmino* hath iustified *Caluins* sense therein; And I thinke that he himselfe hath need to reforme his Argument, lest that he be thought thereby (which is an heresie indeed) to haue diuided the *Essence and substance of God*; and lastly, I should haue repelled his ¹ obiection of *Trinus-vnus*, whereby, after the naming of the Father, Sonne, & Holy-ghost, I complexiue-ly comprehended the Vnitie in Trinitie, according both to the sense of our Christian Article, and also to the forme vsed by Antiquitie; together with the confutation of some other his dissolute exceptions. But these few are sufficient to patterne out this Libeller. Hitherto of his falshoods in his Pamphlet. One word or two of his *Moderate Answer*.

¶ Pag. 49.

¶ Pag. 51.

¶ Pag. 53.

The Pamphleter.

¶ Pag. 16.

He did not object any falshood vnto me in his Preamble, when he was charged to note some falsifications in *Catholikes*.

The Censure.

21 I did not in that little Preamble insist in the Pamphletters

ters vntuerha and falshoods. *Ergo* (by his Logike) I could not proue him to be guiltie of falshood. This is the consequence of this famous scholar, who was chosen to be one of the *Three* (if we beleue himselfe) who should *Dispute* against all *Bishops* and *Doctors* of the Protestant side. But if I aske from what topicke place this Argument is fetch'd, I thinke he will hardly shew any, except it be *absurdo*; because the reason is apparent, why I did not meddle with his falsities, for as then I was to deale only with their *Achilles Bellarmino*, so that I might well neglect this Gleaner. Besides, that I could haue ranged this fellow among the guiltie persons, is as euident by the first Chapter of this *Encounter*, which is spent in repeating the manifold errors and slanders, which this man committed against Protestants, and were so inexcusable, that his Patron *M. Parsons*, when hee should haue satisfied for them, suffered them all to stand still vpon this libellers score; whom (wishing vnto him *adieu*) I leaue fantastically disputing with his owne shadow. And now returne vnto *M. Parsons* his Reckoning.

CHAP. VII.

Containing an Answer vnto the seventh Chapter of *M. Parsons*, concerning the objected Omissions, in not defending them, when he calleth my Clients.

BEER that *M. Parsons* had played the part of a Promoter, in calling into question concealed falsities; (as he vntually termed them) he proceeded to ransacke the foresaid Omissions; in which his Accusation I finde nothing but preposterous and superfluous heaping vp of the ragges of his olde Wardrobe, called the *Mitigation*, and all to the end he might make vp a grosse-bellied booke: wherein he exacteth of me to satisfie for all incommodious speeches, which haue passed from

some

some Protestants, which is a charge that neither I did assume, nor could *M. Parsons* by his Commission impose it vpon me, who is delighted with the irksome iarre of some hot spirits, that rage against *Calvin*, especially in the point of *Arrianisme*.

The summe of *M. PARSONS* Reckoning in this point, concerning *Calvine*.

Reck. pag. 477. I produced at that time somewhat largely and particularly eighteen examples, partly out of the olde, and partly out of the new Testament, maliciously perverted by *Calvine* in fauour of Iewes and Arrians, against the truth and certainty of Christian Religion, leaving out twenty more, which *Dottour Hunnius* doth handle, &c.

The Review.

2. When we do but consider what is the maladic of aduerser criminations, that may serue for a part of an Answer, which *Bellarmino* vscth in like case, *Non multum refert quid irati homines dixerint*. For as when the aire is ouercast with clouds, the very Sunne becommeth inuisible vnto mortall men; so passionate affections sometimes send such grosse vapors into the braine, that the hatred to the true Speaker hindreth a man from discerning of the truth of the speech.

M. Calvine injuriously abused both by *Hunnius* & by *M. Parsons*.

3. And vnto this defect may we partly impute the Accusation which *Hunnius*, and in him now *M. Parsons* doe prosecute against *Calvine*, as though he had in any sort fauoured *Arrianisme*; which I iudge to be an intollerable vntrueth, as both the writings and seale of *Calvine* will perfectly demonstrate. Than the which what greater euidence can any iustly require? First by his writing; for (*Instit. lib. 1. cap. 13.*) he hath published a large and accurate Confutation of that damnable heresie of the *Arrians* from about thirtie testimonies of Scripture, both out of the olde and new Testaments. Secondly, (which I call his *seale*) his publike Act, when he with the whole Senate of *Geneua* (as *Bellarmino* confesseth)

Calvine a professed Adversarie vnto *Arrianisme*.

confesseth) did burne Michael Seruatus a Spaniard for *Arrianisme*. How then will they not (shall we thinke) impute many fallhoods vnto *Caluin* against whom they obiekt a *fauouring of Arrianisme*, albeit they were not ignorant that *Caluin* did both confute the heretic, and (as much as laie in him) burne the Heretike: Could there be any pretence of reason for this Crimination?

^a Bellar. lib. 1. de Christ. in prof. 5. Primi agminis.

The summe of M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Hunnius saith that M. *Caluin* hath peruerterd mankind by his detestable desire of wresting the Scriptures, overthrowing the bulwarkes of Christian Religion, which is hath against Iewes and *Arrians*.

The Reuiew.

4 *Lorinus* a late Iesuit hath this saying: ^b That modest sentence of *S. Hierom* (saith he) doth please me very much, and agreeth most fully with my purpose, whereas speaking of that common exposition upon the Dried bones mentioned in the Prophet *Ezechiel*, which exposition vnderstandeth by those bones the resurrection: but he thinketh that this agreeth not with the literall sense, but that the Prophet by that enigmaticall speech did reuiue the hope of that people: Notwithstanding they that interpret this place otherwise (saith *S. Hierom*) may not be offended with vs, as though we denied the resurrection, for we know that there are found many other much more strong testimonies than these. And when he (saith *S. Hierom*) had brought forth some testimonies, he addeth: by which it is manifest (saith he) that we deny not the resurrection, but onely affirme that these words are not meant of the resurrection, and by the Parable of the resurrection to haue Prophecied of the restitution of the people, which was then in captiuitie: Neither shall we presently give an occasion vnto Heretikes if we deny that these words are not vnderstood of the Common resurrection.

^b Ioh. Lorin. Ios. in Act. Apost. cap. 19. pag. 785. S. Perplacet.

The Argument taken
against Calvin
confuted.

5 Thus far *S. Hierom*, whose testimony pleaseth their Iesuiste, who commendeth it for a *modest sentence*. Let it not displease *M. Parsons* that we apply it vnto *Calvin*, who although he doe not admit of some common expositions of *Scriptures*, which haue beene brought for the confutation of *Arrians*, and *Iewes*, because that they being literally expounded, doe not (in his iudgement) directly make against the enemies of Christs Diuinity. *Notwithstanding they that interpret those places otherwise ought not to be offended with him*, as though he fauoured the opinion of the *Iewes & Arrians*, which he confuteth by many other more strong testimonies of *Scriptures*, out of both the Testaments. *By which it is manifest that he denieth not the Diuinitie of Christ, nor yet properly may be said to haue giuen occasion vnto Heretikes so to doe.* And this is as much as any temperate Aduersary can require to be answered generally in his behalfe.

The singular
estimation
which some
Romanists
gaue concern-
ing the
iudgement of
Caluin.
* Stapleton.
Draf. in Anti-
dot. in Matth.

6 How it may please *M. Parsons* and some others to esteeme of the learning and iudgement of *M. Calvin*, we shall haue lesse cause to regard; seeing that euen his Aduersaries haue not left him altogether destitute of commendations: for their *D. Stapleton* writing an Antidote against his doctrine doth grant *Caluin in his commentaries to be so diligent an Interpreter, according to the letter, so morall, so sweet, that euen men Orthodoxall (he meaneth Papists) desire greedily to read him, whom I haue heard sometime wish (saith he) that those things being purged out of him, which are contrary vnto the Church and faith, he might be suffered to come in publike, for so (say they) his Commentaries might be very profitable.* If his Aduersaries did not except against him, but as they were his Aduersaries, to wit, so far as he held any thing, which was against their Doctrine, otherwise approouing of his workes as profitable vnto the Church, especially in expounding of *Scriptures*, what indifferent Reader is there, but will conceiue that he, who was generally so exact in interpreting *Scriptures*, had likewise some measure of light in discerning of the controuerted Articles of religion? Elsewhere we finde *Card. Bellarmine* writing vnto *Iustus Baronius*, and moouing him

him to indeavour some Confutation of *Calvins Institutions*, (after that he had set out the difficulties of such an enterprise, & excused himselfe) vseth this for one Argument of perswasion, * *Because others had begun such a worke unluckily, and had* a Justus Barrowe more unluckily finished their taske. Confessing in effect, that nim Ep. Socr. lib. cap. 8. *Horantius*, and all other Romish Authors, who had formerly written in Confutation of *Calvins Institutions*, haue been lucklesse and successelesse in their labours. Is not this a Testimony of great honour vnto *Caluin*, especially proceeding from *Bellarmino* so great an Aduersary, both by the worthinesse of his place and learning, and also by the aduersinesse of his opinion? Such lucke haue all they who shall haue truth in respect of mens persons. After *Caluin*, *M. Parsons* snarleth at another person of honour.

SECT. II.

The summe of M. PARSONS his Reckoning.
concerning the Lord Cooke.

Albeit perhaps M. Morton may say, that his meaning was Reck pag. 500. to take in hand the defence of his Client Sir Edw. Cooke, in his other promised Reioynder, and therefore said nothing of him now in this his Preambling Reply: yet hauing now seene him very hardly charged in two seuerall bookes, the one of the Catholike Diuine in answering to the fifth part of his Reports: the other the Treatise of Mitigation, with the like imputation of vntreue dealing, as are laid against M. Morton himselfe, it seemed that it had been a point of friendship (if not of duety) to haue said somewhat for preuenting and staying, at least, the Readers prejudice, as in his Preface he said he did for himselfe, especially for so much as he had seene now, and read all those places, which he borrowed out of M. Cooke, to furnish one whole Chapter of his Full Satisfaction, fully answered and confuted by our Catholike Diuine in his foresaid booke, which M. Morton might haue at least wise mentioned, among so many other points of lesse importance, which he handleth, if his heart had not serued him to rake vpon him the whole Defence.

The Review.

7 *M. Parsons* may remember what he said in his Preface of *Mitigation*, that diuerse *Catholikes* did it to be meddling with *M. Atturney* (now Lord chiefe Iustice of the Common Pleas) for the confuting of his fift part of *Reports*, which *M. Parsons* himselfe hath now begun to impugne. If I haue not bene so forward to vndertake a Replie, it is not that I would be wanting in any part of *Dutie*, but because I was not infected with *M. Parsons* his vnseemely disease, to busie my selfe in an vnproper Element, especially in points which concerne so honourable and iudicious a Personage; who would haue exercised his quill in some large Replie, if his Lordship had thought *M. Parsons* worthy of any other Answer than the condemnation of a *Nihil dicit*.

8 Notwithstanding, it will not (I thinke) offend his honour, nor yet greatly please you, *M. Parsons*, that I, vpon this prouocation, do paint out your vniust Assertions, which you call *Demonstrations*, against his *Reports*, especially concerning the Histories of two *Kings*, which now fall vnder mine eye. The first is of *K. Alfred*, wherein you may be charged with a *numism dicit*: the second is touching *K. Edgar*, whom you will haue to haue *Subordinated* his temporall Sword vnto the spirituall iurisdiction of his Prelates, after that manner of *Subordination*, which you require in Princes at this day. When as it is plaine that King *Edgar* speaking in that *Oration* against sturdy *Monkes*, who did contemne *Verba*, did tell the *BB. Veniendum esse ad Verbera*, that is, That they were to be humbled by *Strakes*: and to this end he saith to the Prelates, *Vobis istud negotium committo, I commit this businesse to you*; which sheweth that that part of authority, which the King acknowledged to be in the *BB.* was not by his *Submission*, but his *Commission* vnto them. What shall we thinke of the validity of his *Ten Demonstrations*, seeing he is so insyncre in these *Two*, which he specified as the most principall?

* *M. Parsons* in his Answ. vnto Sir Edw. Cooke. c. 6. num. 10. p. 151.

† *M. Parsons* citeth from Harpsfield in Hist. Ang. Sc. vol. 9. cap. 5. an Assertion. *Memorati*: but in that Assertion set out by M. Camden Fran. c. 1603. I finde no such speech.

As for his exception against mee, for not *Defending* all those, whom he calleth my Clients, I may iustly answer that although I were worthy of reprehension in this case, yet *M. Parsons* is the most vnwoorthy man of all other to reprehend me, because I finde diuerse of his *Clients* of great name in their church, whom he hath betrayed by his silence.

The Omissions of *M. Parsons*, in not defending
his Clients.

§. III.

9 I had no little cause to woonder at the boldnesse of *M. Parsons*, in calling so clamorously vpon me that I should satisfie for other mens debts, euen in a little *Preamble*, whereas he, in publishing a large volume, in answer of my *Full Satisfaction*, hath passed many whole chapters ouer vntouched, and seeing there many of his own friendes vp to the eares in debt, did like the Iewish Priest and Leuite smoothly passe by without the supply of a farthing for their reliefe. The examples are abundant, I will single out some few.

10 Their ^a *Lodwick of Orleance* (in his booke, *Pag. 48.*) ^b *Full Satisfaction*, was heard rayting vpon the Realme of *England*, that it is *An part. 1. pa. 20.* *Ile of men, who eat mans flesh.* This *M. Parsons* read, but *M. Parsons* his pretermitted. It will be hard to determine whether heere-conniuecy by he haue been more iniurious to his friend *Lodwick*, whom at the slander he suffereth to lie vnder the arrest of a cursed slander, or to his Native Country, which he suffereth to be so ignominiously traduced, as though the Inhabitants thereof were no against his better than *Cannibals*. Country.

11 Secondly ^b there was displaid the Cruelty of their ^b *Pag. 12.* *Inquisitors* by their *Agrippa* (*De vanit. Scient. cap. 69*) noting them to be so rigid in their examination, as not to allow The extremity of the In-
men Conference, but to answer them onely with fire and fag-quisition.
got, who maintaine their cause by the word of God.

12 ^a There also *Arnaldus* in a Parliament at *Paris* was ^a *Pag. 64.* heard to accuse the *Iesuits* to haue been the causes of the great tyrannie which was practised among the poore *Indians*. ^a There ^a *Pag. 115.*

their owne French Historian noted the crueltie which was vsed in France, telling vs how *Twentie thousand Protestants were slaine in one moneth by the furie of the Catholikes. Cruell Inquisitors, cruell Iesuits, cruell Catholikes* (as it is confessed by their owne Authors.) All whom *M. Parsons* leaue as desperate debtors wallowing in their owne guilt.

• *Page 112.*

Slanders against Protestants.

13 Thirdly, there was vnfolded by their owne Historian the slanderous disposition of some Romanists, who bare false witness against Protestants in open Court, affirming that they in the night season *Put out the candles, and euery one tooke a woman at his pleasure*; only vpon a perswasion, *That such an Accusation is good against an Heretike, be it true, or false.* This is a foule matter, and belike *M. Parsons* his fingers were so cleane, that he would not touch it.

A Confutation of their common seditious positions.

• *Page 31.*

14 Fourthly, their common doctrine being this, that a *King being an Heretike and excommunicate may be deposed*, was proued to be a rebellious doctrine by many arguments, which *M. Parsons* would not so much as looke at: and to the same purpose was alleged the confession of their own Iesuit *Acosta* (our of his second booke *de Indorum salute*, cap. 5.) affirming that after that a King is established in his throne, his power is from God, and the people owe him *subiection*, euen as did the people of Israel vnto *Ieroboam* (3. Re. 11. & 12.) albeit he was an Apostata from the faith of the true Church. This *M. Parsons* thought not good to account for, lest this example might haue conuincd him and his fellowes of seditious and pernicious doctrine. And there also wee read of the example of the elder Romish Clergie, brought in to condemne the later brood of sedition: but this also had his passe.

• *Page 62.*

• *Full Satisfact.*
part. 3. ca. 20.

A Raicke confessed to be the best remedie against some Equiuocators.

15 Fifthly, by the testimonie of their Cardinall *Tolet* (*Instruct. Sacerd. lib. 5. cap. 66.*) we were taught that although their Priests and others may in their examinations, before Magistrates, whom they holde to be incompetent, vse Equiuocation, rather than to reueale any trespasse of an other: yet *If they shal be brought vnto the racke to be tortured, they are no further bound to concale the truth.* Whereupon

it

it followeth, that in such cases their most competent Iudge will be a racke. *M. Parsons* saw this Racke; but only saw it: for, in his discourse of *Equiuocation*, he came not nere it by a mile.

16 Sixtly, ¹ Cardinall *Bellarmino* did interpret the place ¹*Ibid. part. 3.* of *S. Paul, Rom. 13.* [*Let every soule be subiect to the higher* ^{pag. 39.} powers] to imlie the Spirituall power, as well as the Temporall: but was confuted by their *Espencens* (*in 1st. 3. 1.* ^{Scripture per-} *Digress. pag. 513.*) from the iudgement of ancient Fathers, ^{verted by Bel-} *larmine.* no one allowing that interpretation. The place of a Cardinall should haue moued *M. Parsons* to haue yeilded some piece of an Answer for his dearest friend, if the truth of the cause would haue so permitted.

17 But how will he answer for others, ² who leaueth ²*Ibid. part. 1.* himselfe in the lurch? who together with *Carerius*, thought ^{pag. 43.} that *Nothing is to be acknowledged to be a king, before he be anointed.* Which Paradox was firmly and freely confuted by ^{A paradox.} their *Barkley* (*in lib. 3. cont. Monarchom. cap. 2.*) I let passe diuers such particular persons, and chuse rather to obserue his want of *dutie*, or els of *abilicie*, in answering for his head-father the Pope.

M. PARSONS his notable *Omissions*, in forsaking the necessarie defence of Popes.

§. IV.

18 The Oration of Pope ³ *Xistus Quintus* is famous for ³ *Ib. pag. 75.* commending *Iacob Clemens*, who was the murtherer of *Henry 3.* King of France; and for that cause was that Pope propounded as the Patron and indeed paterne of all rebellious Doctors. Which doctrine was likewise obiected to the ^{Pope Xistus} *Moderate Answerer*, but he very moderately forbore euen to ^{his orauon.} taste or touch it. After him *M. Parsons* the *Mitigator* beheld the vgly spectacle, and swallowed this whole Camell. Now at length he commeth in with a new Reckoning, but doth not reckon for this his grandfathers debt. ⁴ *Boucher* ⁴ *Pag. 77.* also was brought in by *Barkley* (*lib. 6. contr. Monarchom. c.*

28. pag. 536.) commending the act, and reioycing thereat, whom the foresaid Barkley doth therefore condemne (pag. 535. & 539.) of treason, for patronizing that fact, and by doctrine perswading ment hereunto.

* Pag. 91.

The periurie
of a Pope.

* Full Satisfact.

Part. 3. pag. 17. 8. and another of Pius Quintus against Q. Elizabeth, were heard bellowing out a Fulnesse of Apostolicall authoritie for the rooting out of Nations, and of Kingdomes, according vnto that of Hier. 1. Behold, I haue appointed thee ouer Nations, to root them vp, and to destroy them. Which Papall exposition of that text was an impudent glosing. M. Parsons can * say nothing but that it was spoken by allusion vnto that text of Jeremy, which poore ragge can not possibly couer so great a shame: for the text of Jeremy was expressly cited in their Bulles for confirmation of their authority, by way of interpretation, accordingly as their Carerius (lib. 1. de potestate Pape) had done. But it was confuted by the true and proper expositions of Lyra, who said that the Prophet Ieremie did not destroy, but only denounce they should be destroyed: By S. Gregorie, who noteth not destruction by fighting, but only by preaching: But especially by S. Bernard (lib. 2. de Consid. ad Eugen.) reproving the Pope for the abuse of this place, by turning the spirituall and ministeriall rooting out of sinners into a Temporall dominion. Heere M. Parsons imitated the Egyptian dogs, Lambunt & fugiunt, they vsed to lap a little at the riuier Nilus, and forthwith to run away, and all for feare of a Crocodile. So heere the Mitigator tooke a bite, but spying Lyra, Gregorie, and Bernard make against the Popes, and perceiuing that his Answer of Allusion was but an Illusion, he speedily tooke his course another way.

* Mitigat. esp.

5. pag. 17 1.

19 There came in also a Canonist, who reported the periurie of Pope Gregory 12. whom M. Parsons suffered to die in debt, neuer opening his mouth to free him either à toto, or à tanto. After this the Bull of Pope Paulus 3. against Hen. Part. 3. pag. 17. 8. and another of Pius Quintus against Q. Elizabeth, were heard bellowing out a Fulnesse of Apostolicall authoritie for the rooting out of Nations, and of Kingdomes, according vnto that of Hier. 1. Behold, I haue appointed thee ouer Nations, to root them vp, and to destroy them. Which Papall exposition of that text was an impudent glosing. M. Parsons can * say nothing but that it was spoken by allusion vnto that text of Jeremy, which poore ragge can not possibly couer so great a shame: for the text of Jeremy was expressly cited in their Bulles for confirmation of their authority, by way of interpretation, accordingly as their Carerius (lib. 1. de potestate Pape) had done. But it was confuted by the true and proper expositions of Lyra, who said that the Prophet Ieremie did not destroy, but only denounce they should be destroyed: By S. Gregorie, who noteth not destruction by fighting, but only by preaching: But especially by S. Bernard (lib. 2. de Consid. ad Eugen.) reproving the Pope for the abuse of this place, by turning the spirituall and ministeriall rooting out of sinners into a Temporall dominion. Heere M. Parsons imitated the Egyptian dogs, Lambunt & fugiunt, they vsed to lap a little at the riuier Nilus, and forthwith to run away, and all for feare of a Crocodile. So heere the Mitigator tooke a bite, but spying Lyra, Gregorie, and Bernard make against the Popes, and perceiuing that his Answer of Allusion was but an Illusion, he speedily tooke his course another way.

* Full Satisfact.

Part. 3. pag. 18.

20 For further demonstration of the noueltie and impietie of the Papall claime in temporall affaires, for the refusing of Emperours, and deposing of Kings from their Soueraignty, there was produced the example of Christ, who thought his

his temporall Dominion superfluous for him, as Bellarmine confessed: then the example of the ¹ *Apostles, who were subiect* ¹ *Pag. 19.*
 unto *Heathenish Emperours*: after that ¹ the examples of ¹ *Pag. 21.*
All Christians for the first two hundred yeares, who albeit some- ¹ *Antiquity of*
time they had equall force, yet they professed subiection unto tem- ¹ *Subiection of*
porall Magistrates, whereby the doctrine of Christians became ¹ *Clergy men*
glorious, as Tolossanus confessed. And unto these were ¹ *unto Tempo-*
added the answerable Testimonies of Tertullian, Cyprian, Nazian- ¹ *rall States.*
Athanas. Ambrose, Basil, Gregory. Heere the maine que- ¹ *Pag. 22. into*
stion of Allegiance was handled, and prooued from Anti- ¹ *Pag. 26.*
quity, heere, if euer, the Pope did need his helpe. But such
was the desperatenesse of the cause, that M. Parsons would
not come off not with so much as a bare-faced groat, in
part of payment.

Finally, their ¹ *Sanders* intruded himselfe, 'auouching ¹ *Ibid. pag. 29.*
 the *Donation of Constantine*, wherein all the kingdomes of the ¹ *31. & 32.*
 Western world were said to haue beene conferred by the
 Empetour *Constantine* vpon Pope *Syluester*, Anno. 300. and The Donati-
 unto him *Carerius* assented; and all for the magnifying of on of Con-
 the Papall iurisdiction in temporall things. Which other of stantine coun-
 their Doctours did thus far confute, as to grant that *The most* ¹ *terfeit.*
ancient Histories & Authors of best credit, and such as did pur-
posely record the Acts of Constantine, did not make mention of
that Donation. So Canus (loc. Theol. lib. 1. cap. 5.) Which Pope
Pius Secundus did count to be a counterfeit Donation: so Balbus
lib. de Coronat, seeing that Pope Boniface 9. Anno. 1400. was
the first that challenged the Donation of the City of Rome, saith
the same Balbus. Adde we heereunto how ¹ *Pag. 32.*
Carerius preten-
 ded that the Emperor must necessarily haue the Popes *Con-*
fimation: which dealing their Lupoldus, and Balbus both Bi-
shops, did preoue to be most false. I supposed if his ability
had been answerable to his charity, he would not haue suf-
fered Iesuits, Priests, and Popes to languish vnder these Ar-
rests, yet all this while we heare not of our friend the Mode-
rate Answerer. Will M. Parsons neglect him also?

The *Omissions* of *M. Parsons*, in neglecting his peculiar Client the *Moderate Answerer*: leauing him in the conuiction of many foule errors and slanders.

§. V.

21 This *Moderate Answerer* is the man that writ against the booke of *Disconery of Romish Positions, and Practises of rebellion*, whom therefore *M. Parsons* hath particularly commended for one, who acquitted himselfe learnedly: So that this man might seeme to haue a peculiar interest in *M. Parsons* his patronage. Shall we now trie how he is often left in the lurch to shift for himselfe. I may not insist in all points, yet some few I may not omit.

22 The *Moderate Answerer* answered for his Catholikes
 * Full Satisfact. in generall, that they taught not * *A power simply ouer Kings*
 part. 3. pag. 33. in temporall affaires, which was prooued to be a singular fall-
 34 hood out of their *Bozius*, and especially out of *Cacerius*, who
 challenged the Common consent of Canonists, and Diuines to
 the contrary. * He, vnder the names of two or three Au-
 57 thors pretended that their Doctores *Defended not violent de-*
 posing of Kings, who are, in their opinion, Heretikes: which
 is a most prodigall vntruth, and so prooued to be by the tes-
 timonies of their Moderne Doctores, such as were *Rainolds*,
 66 *Parsons*, *Alen*, *Coster*, *Bellarmino*, and others. * He propoun-
 ded a Canon teaching that *No Clerks may take armes, neither*
by their owne, nor by the Popes authority: as though any such
 Canon were now in force; which was prooued to be a loose
 ouerlashing by their *Rainolds*, *Alan*, and by * *Sanders*. * He
 67 in the name of all Romanists, did teach that they *Allow Ma-*
 86 gistrates, who are Protestants, to be as competent Iudges in all
 temporall causes, in as ample maner, as if they were of their
 owne Religion, before whom, iudging according vnto law, they
 may not equivocate. Wherein he was contradicted by *Rai-*
nolds, who absolutely denied that Protestants haue any au-
 thority

thority over them ; and by *Cardinall Allen*, and *M. Parsons*, who taught that *Priests may equivocate before them, because they be Tyrants*. In these the Answerer needed *M. Parsons*, his helpe, but it would not be ; belike he iudged that the Answerer, for moderating of matters, had erred immoderately.

23 Furthermore, he was directly noted to haue ' slan- ^{Full Satisf.}
dered an *Author*, as though he had taught Subiects to fight ^{part. 2. pa. 106.}
against their Kings ; and was confuted by the words of the ^{Notorious}
Author himselfe. There followed his ' slanders against ^{Slanders.}
Caluin, and *Beza*, and confuted from the confessions of them ^{¶ Ibid. pa. 107.}
both. He ' pursued *Beza* yet more extremly, to make him ^{¶ 109.}
guilty of the death of the Duke of Guize, suborning *Puleros* ^{¶ Pag. 114.}
to kill him : wherein he was confuted by the testimony of ^{Slander a-}
their owne Historian. He ' obiected a *Conuenticule* held at ^{gainst Caluin}
Cabellion, wherein he said it was decreed by Protestants that ^{and Beza.}
All the families of ancient houses, and all civil government should ^{¶ Pag. 120.}
be taken out of the World : where he was charged to shew his
Authour or else to confesse his slander. These foure grosse
slanders are so many debts, & the debter *Non est soluendo*, had
nothing to pay, therefore *M. Parsons* was loath to meddle
with him for the discharge of his Reckoning.

24 He staid not here, but fell afresh vpon *Luther*, making
him ' say that *Among Christians there is no Magistrate, no* ^{¶ Pag. 121. &}
Superiour : which wicked falshood was expressely control- ^{123.}
led by the contrary doctrine of *Luther*, out of his *Tom. 1. in Slander a.*
Gen. c. 9. where he condemneth the Pope and his Clergy, ^{gainst Luther.}
for shaking off the yooke of temporall gouernment. But not
contented with this, he ' imposeth againe vpon *Luther* the ^{¶ Pag. 126.}
cause of the losse of *Belgrade*, and *Rhodes* by the hands of
the *Turke*, his entrance vpon *Hungary*, together with the
death of *King Lodonick* and *Buda* conquered, citing for prooffe
thereof *Munster*, and *Pantaleon*, which points were exami-
ned, his allegations were prooued falsifications; and the cause
of the ruine of *Hungary*, and of *Bohemia*, the losse of *Rhodes*,
together with a thousand such Evils, was attributed vnto the
Conuentionesse of the Pope of Rome, by their owne Historians.

25 Lastly, ' he maketh *Luther* to be of the same opinion = ^{¶ Pag. 127.}

and practise of Rebellion, with Muntzer: which was proved to be an vgly fallshood by their owne Authour Peter Frarer, who confessed that Luther writ against that Muntzer, and his Complices, and exhorted all Christians to persecute those rebellious ones vnto death. Could there be any fouler slanders than these, or more plainly discovered? Notwithstanding this Moderate Answerer hath behaued himselfe thus; yet hath he been said by M. Parsons to haue acquitted himselfe learnedly. But what shall I say; but like Patron, like Client? Thus much for Omissions.

An Answer vnto M. PARSONS eight Chapter:
concerning the *L. Coke*.

§. VI.

26 M. Parsons directeth his eight chapter of his Reckoning only vnto my Lord Coke concerning the * *Municipall Lawes of England*, which Argument he himselfe did before prosecute vnder the name of a *Catholike Diuino*: wherein he seemeth to be so conuerfant, as if he had turned his *Diuinitie* into humane *Policie*; yet peraduenture so vnskilfully, that the verse of *Nauita de ventis &c.* may be inuerted vpon him thus; *Nauita de terris, de ventis narrat arator*. After a long intermission (as he calleth it) of his affaires, by interlacing a Treatise against the Lord Coke, (whereunto he expecteth no Answer from me) hee calleth againe vpon me in his next Chapter.

An Answer vnto M. PARSONS his ninth Chapter,
concerning the *Fresh lies*, as heelyngly calleth
them, and recapitulateth.

§. VII.

The summe of M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reck. pag. 625. **I**N this ninth chapter is layed together another choice number
of new and fresh vntruths of later date in the last Replie of
M.

M. Morton : and albeit those that are to be touched in this chapter have been, for the most part, handled and discussed before, yet that they may be more effectually represented unto the eye and memorie of the Reader, by putting the principall of them together in a rancke, &c.

The Review.

27 At the first reading of this inscription of a new chapter of *new and fresh lies*, I thought that *M. Parsons* would have brought in some new charges, which have not hitherto been mentioned; but by his next words, telling vs that *These for the most part have been handled before*, I do perceiue that his *fresh* criminations are stale, and smell rancke both of fraud (by intituling twelue leaues *New and fresh lies*) and also of plaine fallhood, by saying that they have been handled, but only for the most part: for I see none at all now alleged which he hath not alreadie handled in his former Reckoning, but yet with vnwashed hands and heart, as my Answer hath particularly disclosed. And now I make bold to call *M. Parsons* to a summary account of his owne charges.

His excellent
fraud.

A brieue Recapitulation of the manifolde frauds and falsities of M. PARSONS, which have been discovered in this Reckoning.

28 Vpon the sight of his repetition of *falsehoods*, which he hath vntruly imputed vnto me, I haue been prouoked to requite his iniurious dealing with a summarie recognition and recapitulation of the principall vntrueths, which I haue truly layed vnto his charge, and haue alreadie handled: which now I need not touch, but only point at, according to the marginall Notes of this *Encounter*.

29 The first booke cap. 2. one fallhood, cap. 4. another, cap. 6. two, cap. 7. two, cap. 8. two, cap. 10. foure, cap. 12. fifteen; and then many other in one: and after that eleuen more, cap. 13. six, cap. 14. also eleuen. Then in the second

booke, *cap. 1.* many in one; and againe, three more: *cap. 2.* seuen, *cap. 3.* foure, *cap. 4.* two, *cap. 5.* diuers in obiecting heapes of falshoods; besides his manifold guiles and frauds, and ridiculous vanities, wherewith almost euery page is bespangled, which might make vp as many moe notes of insinceritie, if I would but vse *M. Parsons* his art of Reckoning. But the former kinde, which haue been pointed at, being both so many and so manifest vntueths, may serue for *M. Parsons* his conuiction, for I may well spare the confession of their owne Priest, who notifieth *M. Parsons* how prone he is to forge and falsifie.

CHAP. VIII.

Containing an Answer vnto M. Parsons his tenth chapter.

§. I.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.



He tenth and last Chapter conteineth his new challenges, protestations, and vaunts, wherein hee hath inwrapped himselfe in the bands of further absurdities.

The Reuiew.

THE particulars of this last part of your Reckoning are not of any such nature, that they may require any large Discourse. I will therefore be brieue, taking them as I finde them distinguished into matters which more specially concerne me, and your selfe. First of the first.

The summe of M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

*Reckon. cap. 10. pag. 651. He protesteth for his owne sinceritie and diligence in reviewing his booke, yet is forced to confesse in his owne defence some-
time*

time that he did not see the *Authour* that he citeth himselfe, but received it of some others, &c. He hath taken in hand Bellarmine, to picke out matter out of him, that might seeme to beare some shew of vnrtrueth, but hath been able to finde no one, as we haue made it plaine in the third chapter. Thirdly, the Reckoning being now made vp, and especially in our last three precedent chapters, he had obiected against him foureteen falsehoods, which he chose to answer, but could not: and then twice foureteen, which he willingly pretermitted: and lastly, a number of new lies, uttered in discharge of the former.

The Review.

2 I stand in the same protestation still against all wilfull transgression. And to the first I answer, that I neuer heard before, that the citing of testimonies vpon credit could be named *Insinceritie*, the examples of which maner of dealing are infinite euen in our Aduersaries themselves: whereof one example doth euen now offer it selfe from *Cardinall Baronius*. He (writing of the maner of the martyrdom of *Zoticus*) complained that he was wrong informed by one that writ letters vnto him, *Testifying that he had found them in the Acts of Zoticus, but afterwards reading the Acts my selfe* (saith Baronius) *I found no such matter in them.* And so likewise both *Bellarmino* and *Boucher* * haue been by their owne friends noted to haue offended in this kinde. Neither yet were the escapes, wherein *M. Parsons* insisteth, so inexcusable on my part, as he would inforce.

3 To the second, I say, that if my Reader will be pleased to examine the falsehoods which were * vriged against *Cardinall Bellarmine*, he shall finde that the obiections are no picked quarrels, but plaine conuictions, as hath been proued, and whereof I shall giue the Reader a *Synopsis* in the next Chapter.

4 To the third I need say no more but that I haue answered those particulars to the full, where the Reader may finde iust cause to abhorre the vilenesse of your calumnious, false and vnconscionable Reckoning.

M.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reck. pag. 654. Fourthly, I shall set downe the words of a *stranger*, by which it is manifest what stuffe is contained in his Latine booke of Apologie: his words are these: Quid Mortoni editionem retardarit, &c.

The Review.

M. Parsons
maruellous
incircumspe-
ction through
his greedie
humor to ca-
lumniate.
* Declaratio
motuum & tur-
bationum inter
Iesuitas & Sa-
cerdotes. Ad
Clementem
Pont.
* The booke of
Important
considerati-
ons; and the
book of Quod-
libets.

5 Heere he hath obiected against me a *stranger* and Adversarie in Religion to be my Accuser, to preiudice my sinceritie; neuer regarding that it is as easie for me to returne vpon him, not a *Stranger*, but his owne countrey-men; nor Adversaries in profession, but his fellow-souldiers & Priests, who haue bespotted him in their publike writings dedicated vnto the ^b Pope, and ^c others, with more vgly marks of a lying, slanderous, libellious, treacherous, and bloudy behauiour, than I haue read obiected vnto any man of what profession whomsoever, in this latter age. But I am not delighted with fingering other mens vlcers, nor will I vex M. Parsons with repetitions thereof.

6 As for my selfe, as yet I can say no more vnto his *Stranger*, but that he is a *Stranger* vnto me, and when I shall be better acquainted with him by his booke, I shall (God willing) answer him, although not according to his acerbitie of words, yet according to the truth and equitie of the cause; whereby I shall be better occasioned to set abroach in Latine the formerly confessed falsehoods of Bellarmine, Baronius, Boucher, M. Parsons, and others. But why hath not M. Parsons Englished that Epistle of the *Stranger*?

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Reck. pag. 656. I haue thought good not to translate this Epistle into English, for that there be some words therein more sharpe than I would willingly vse against an Adversary; whom I seeke rather to pacifie, and satisfie with reason.

The

The Review.

7 When *Rabshakah* came against *Judah*, blaspheming God, and vilifying their King, the Elders requested him not to speake in the vulgar language of the people, but in a strange tongue : but *Rabshakah* would not yeeld vnto them.

2. Kings, 18.

M. Parsons will seeme to be more fauourable, he will not Englishie, why ? *They are too sharpe*. Heere, I confesse, I know not his meaning, why he should spare me in this, who hath shewen himselfe thorowout his Reckoning more sharp and galfull, then any other Aduersary hath beene. Vnto this *Stranger* he is pleased in his courtesie to adioyne the censure of *Gretzer* a Dutch Iesuite against me. But if it would haue likewise pleased *M. Parsons* to haue red the places wherein he taketh exception, and to haue examined them, I durst bide his owne censure betweene me and *Gretzer* : whose dispraise I account an honour vnto me, both because I see him with as high contempt vilifie those learned and godly men, with whom I may not make any shadow of comparison.

M. Parsons his
præence of
sauor.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

I cannot let passe to set downe the iudgement of an other learned *Stranger* extant in a printed booke of his in defence of Card. Bellarmine, whom *M. Morton* chiefly pretendeth to impugne, but so weakely and absurdly as the said learned man giueth a very contemptible censure of the whole worke, saying : Hoc opus sensu Bellar. pag. merito suo inter stultissima. &c.

Recken. pa. 656

Gretzer in do.

435.

The Review.

8 And I cannot but thanke you that you would honour me with his Contemnable Censure, for so I doe esteeme it ; especially knowing the Author to be *James Gretzer*, who is a superlatiue Contemner of all his Aduersaries, whereof some were far more learned than himselfe : Censuring *D. Wha-*

Gretzer his
Cocoëthes
and habituall
salt humor in
dispraising his
Aduersaries.

kers thus, *Mendax Spiritus; Mendax Confessio; Mendax Historia; mendacia omnia; delirat, non argumentatur.* Censuring D. Lubbertus thus: *Si quis velis octo mendaciorum millia facile possit ex eius pagellis colligere, is febriculosus sua phantasia deliravit. Vix ullum reperi, qui in mendacijs cum eo comparari queat.* Censuring Lamb. Danaus thus: *In toto eius Responso ne mica quidem boni, & ingenui, et eruditi Viri; adeo omnia mendacijs et nugamentis horrent.* Censuring Franciscus Iunius thus: *Tu mendaciter omnia; omnia falso; omnia imperiè.* Censuring Aegidius Hummius thus: *Evidenter apparet, Hummius nihil aliud fuis, quam os & lingua sine mente; Deliravit.* Censuring D^r. Reynaldus thus: *Nihil aliud est quam mendaciorum quidem minimè pertusus sacculus.* Censuring the Phoenix of this age Ioseph Scaliger thus: *Potius Onologia quam Chronologia condit:* In respect of all these I doe confesse my selfe to be worthily contemptible. But yet who knoweth not, that this kinde of censure, without prooffe, is but the language of Canaan, meere railing? which this Gretzer doth not practise onely, but even also professe. And every one can vnderstand that the dispraise of an Aduersary, and the praise of a mans selfe are both but stinking breathes.

9 Heere againe (as before) I could requite M. Parsons with an other kinde of censure, passed vpon him not by his Aduersaries in religion, but by his owne brotherhood, whereby they make him not contemptible onely but even the most execrable man of his profession: but *Non est crimen proprium nescire alienum.* I therefore answer for my selfe, desiring M. Parsons to loooke into Gretzer, and to examine the places wherein he doth insist in Confutation of any thing that I haue written, and iudge betweene vs, and accordingly to esteeme of Gretzers Censure. In the meane time I shall answer vnto the censure which M. Parsons himselfe hath made against me.

M.

M. PARSONS his Reckoning.

Neither will I allege any thing inturiously against M. Morton's person, which I doe loue from my heart in the true loue of Christ our Saviour, wishing his best spirituall good, as mine owne, and doe esteeme him also for the good parts that God hath bestowed vpon him, though I doe pittie the euill imployment thereof in the cause he defendeth.

The Renew.

10 You shal not need (*M. Parsons*) to do that you haue abundantly done, which is, *To allege matters inturiously against me.* Notwithstanding I do imbrace your tender of loue, and shall (I hope) not be ouercome in this contention, by affecting your eternall good, euen as mine owne; neither shall I further esteeme of my selfe, than that my imploiment may be for defence of a cause, which I ought to loue a thousand times aboute my selfe. *Hactenus deuit.* Now I come to you, *M. Parsons.*

M. Parsons
greatpretence
of charity to-
wards his Ad-
uersary.

S E C T. II.

Concerning the Challenges made against
M. PARSONS.

M. PARSONS Reckoning.

M. Morton hath left himselfe through vehemency of Passion in this place, where he censurcth his Adversary in fewer severall challenges, which I haue thought good to set downe together, and me to answer them severally, as I did in the former Paragraph, for that indeed there is in them nothing but excesss of intemperate heat in contemptuous speech: &c.

The renew.

11 If *M. Parsons* would haue considered either his owne

desert, or my behaiour, he would neuer haue complained of contumelious speeches. For neither am I so lauish, but that their owne Apologists, (whom he greatly commendeth) haue allowed me the Title of *A man not intemperate*, neither yet vsed *M. Parsons* to be so moderate, but that his owne fellow could note him, from the mouth of Cardinall *Alan*, to be a man of a *Very violent, and vnquiet spirit*. Yea, and *M. Parsons* himselfe also hath wished that *He had not vsed such asperity of speech against me*. Wherefore I passe ouer personal and offensiue tearmes, which notwithstanding were onely expressed in Latine, and I come to the Materiall points to trie, whether I haue beene able to performe my challenge against him or not.

* The Apologie
for the Rom.
Church, the 2.
edition, in the
Praef. to the
Reader, pag. 10.
* Quod lib. pag.
236.
* Reck. pa. 669.

There were
four principall
parts of the cha-
llenge against
M. Parsons.

1. The Discouery of Romish Positions and practises of Rebellion to be iust.
2. His Treatise of Adignation to be falsly so intituled.
3. His Admittall Equiuocation to be an Art of lying.
4. The Romanists to support their causes by lying.

The Performance of the first part of the Challenge.

12. As the presence of light dispelleth darknesse, so *Verum est Index sui, & obliqui*. Seeing now therefore, that after *M. Parsons* hath made his full Reckoning, and that answer hath beene made to all his exceptions, we finde that their former *Bulles*, and practises of their Popes (such as were Pope *Greg. 7. Paulus 3. Sixtus Quintus, Pius Quintus*) and that the sentences of their owne Doctors (such as were *Card. Bellarmine, Boucher, Carerius, Boxius, Rainolds, Allen, Smancha, Costerus, Sanders, Creswell, Dolman*) doe without exemption, defend a rooting out of all Princes, who shall not subiect themselves vnder the Pope of Rome, when se-

* See these
points about
cap. 7.

uer there is a sufficient power to preuaile: Albeit it doth no lesse manifestly appeare, and that by the confession of their owne Authors, that in the time of the old law, the *High Priests were subiect vnto Kings*; And in the new Testament that *Christ*, and his immediate Disciples did not affect, or exercise power ouer Kings in Temporall things, and (as for the succeeding Fathers, such as were *Tert. Cyprian, Chrysostom, Athanasius, Ambrose, Leo, Augustine, and Gregory the Great*) that they (as it hath beene likewise confessed) did professe their subiection vnto the *Emperours* of their time, according to the doctrine maintained in our Church. All these Considerations cannot but iustifie the first part of my Challenge, concerning the *Discovery of seditious Romish Positions, and Practises of Rebellion.*

The discharge of the second Part.

13 As for the decyphering of the disloyall affection of *M. Parsons* the former *Mitigator*, what can be more pregnant then are his owne clauses, who permitteth a *subiection* vnto Protestant Kings with a *May*, and of a *Possibility*, instead of a *Must*, and *Necessity*; who also alloweth his Catholics to acknowledge their loyalty vnto our king only, so long as they are *Vsed as Subiects*, and then complaineth that they are not *Vsed as Subiects*: Who teacheth that they who are *Lawfully Excommunicate* by the Pope, & persist obstinate, *may not be heads in Christian Communion*, who can afford no more grievous epithet vnto the horrible plot of the *Gunpowder Treason*, than to call it *A remembrance*, notwithstanding it were a fact, which both heaven and earth doe detest, and at which hell it selfe (as it were) standeth all agast: who being vrged to answer whether their party would not eradicate Protestants, if they had power to execute their will, could finde no better euasion then to say that the question was *Impertinent*: Finally, who defendeth the booke of *D. man. als. Parsons*, which hath bene condemned by their owne Priest, as most *Rebellious* against the English State,

⁴ Lib. 1. cap. 3.

⁵ 4.

⁶ Ibidem.

⁷ Cap. 12. §. 13.

⁸ num. 63.

⁹ Cap. 14. §.

¹⁰ num. 36.

¹¹ 16th Sect. 11.

¹² num. 61.

How shall not this be held a iust performance of the second part of the Challenge?

The discharge of the third part of the Challenge, against *Mentall Equiuocation*; as it hath beene described by M. Parsons.

14 The *Mentall Equiuocation*, which M. Parsons hath propounded, as iustificable in the iudgement of all Schooles, Chaires, and Vniuersities, is in sundry places of this *Especially lib. 1. cap. 4. & ca. Reason*, but also from the iudgement of Romish Doctors; such as were *Sepulveda, Aquinas, Gabriel Bial, Scotus, Henricus de Gandavo, Azorius, and Sotus*: and was neuer iustified for true by any *Heathenish man*; whereof there will be occasion to say much more in the answer to the *Appendix* following; wherein the Reader will finde (I hope) a due satisfaction to this question.

The performance of the last part of the Challenge, to wit, that the great *Supports of Romanists* is by *lying Deuises*.

15 What would any Reader require, for the due performance of this discharge? The dispositions, which their Writers haue to falsifie? Then see aboue their *Suaris* condemned by *Councils*; their *Bellarmin* reprooued by their *Venetian Doctor*; their *Boucher* controlled by *Barclay*; their *Gratian* corrected by their Archbishop *Tarraconensis*; their *Bellarmin* condemned by *Marplus*, by *P. Paulus*, and *Barclay*; and lastly their *M. Parsons* and their *Moderato* Pamphletted confuted in this *Encounter*.

16 Would he furthermore haue it shewne vnto him, wherein they haue abused the Fathers? hee need but looke backe againe vnto the former Chapters, where *Bellarmin* is deprehended in that guile; where their *Coccini* (whom I

was

was challenged by *M. Parsons* to examine) is convicted of about 40. transgressions ; in producing Fathers in the defence of but one doctrine of *Purgatory*.

17 Doth he desire to vnderstand some thing of their slanders against their Aduersaries ? then let him see the 11. which *Bellarmin.* did iniuriously object against Protestants ; besides others committed by ** Surinus*, & the ** Moderate Answerer* ; and *M. Parsons*, as hath appeared thorow our this whole *Encounter* ; to which may be added a memorable slander about a Yorkshire case, discovered heereafter in the next Chapter in Answer to his Appendix.

18 What shall wee speake of the foundation of some doctrines of theirs by *Deceitfull Apparitions of the dead* ; and the seales of their superstitions, their false ** Miracles* ? ** See the Catalogue like Appeals.*
or else false doctrines themselves, like vnto their doctrine of ** Indulgences*, which have beene confessed by some to be but a kinde of *Deceits* ? To omit their fictitious Canon of ** Appelles to Rome* in spirituall Cases ; the more fabulous ** Donation of Constantine*, in behalfe of their Temporall power. ** Ibidem, l. 1. cap. 2. §. 20. &c. & lib. 2. c. 15. & l. 4. c. 25.*

19 Peradventure he desireth to be acquainted with some corruption of bookes, which a man may call the *Falsities of Falsities* ; then let him but remember the complaint, which their owne *Martinius* hath made against their practise of Razing something out of the ** Councils, Canons, and Historians* ; some experience whereof we haue taken in *M. Parsons* his exceptions against ** Maldenare, * Polydore, and * Erasmus*. As for their maner of *Mentall Equivocation*, we haue prooued already to be but an artificiaall lie : whereof some thing more remaineth to be spoken now in Answer vnto *M. Parsons* his Appendix, and as also touching his imagined *Yorkshire Case of Equivocation*. ** See above lib. 1. ca. 1. num. 18. & lib. 1. ca. 13. & lib. 1. c. 14. & lib. 1. c. 13. §. 4.*

CHAP. IX.

Containing an Answer vnto *M. Parsons* his Appendix, which he hath inscribed thus.

Rechen. pa. 671.

AN Appendix concerning a case of Equiuocation lately written out of England, wherein resolution is demanded about the false Oath of two Ministers: Whether it may be salued by the licence of Equiuocation, or no? Together with a note out of *D. King* his Sermon, preached at the Court 5. of Nouemb. 1608. so farre forth as it toucheth Equiuocation.

The Renew.

§. I.

1. At the very entrance into this Appendix I first vnderstood of the late death of *M. Parsons*, and shall therefore a little rebate and blunt my style, because I loue not, *quasi cum laurio luctari*, to insult too personally vpon the dead. To this purpose I shall omit the ordinary *Apostrophe* of speaking to him in the second person, by challenging him to his face, and shall vse his name onely so farre as both the state, absence, and condition of this cause shall permit or require.

2. This his Appendix comprizeth first a wilde slander against a Protestant Minister, by pretence of an vgly Equiuocating Case, supposed to haue beene acted in *York-shire*: And secondly a transgression (as it may seeme) against the truth of *Christ* the Sonne of God, whom (in the Taxation, which he vseth against the Sermon of *D. King*) hee seimeth to haue patronized and practised that forme of Equiuocation, which hee himselfe hath professed and defended in his Bookes. The point of slander, about the Case of *York-shire*, seemeth to containe three parts of Oratory. 1. An *Exordium*, or Preface: 2. A *Narration* or declaration of the Case; and lastly a determination and *Conclusion* thereof.

The

The Preface, which M. PARSONS vscth for
an introduction of the pretended
York-shire Case.

I receiued, gentle Reader, not long since by a letter of the eight *Rechen pa. 671*
of Nouember Anno. 1608. from a friend of mine dwelling in the
North parts of England, a certaine Advertisment about a case
of Equiuocation fallen out in those parts, wherein my said friende
requested my iudgement, whether the same were tollerable, or
excusable, or not? And for that it seemed he had some right to
urge me in the matter, in respect of the Treatise written by me of
that argument against M. Morton I thought my selfe the more
bound to yeeld him some satisfaction to his demand.

The Reuiew, discovering the forgery of this Case
by foure probabilities, taken out of M.
PARSONS his *Exordium.*

3 Because this case is made so notorious, that the relation thereof, if it be true, must needs bewray exceeding mischief on the one side, or else on the other side extreame malice, if it shall appeare to be false: I shall intreate thee (*Good Reader*) to obserue and ponder the circumstances of this *Preface*, which *M. Parsons* hath commended vnto thee; and to consider, first, *Who* it is that inquireth whether this pretended *Equiuocation* be *Tollerable*, or not? *M. Parsons* hath told vs that he is his *Friend*; and in that (according to his profession) no great friend vnto any Protestant. Is it not therefore altogether improbable, that his conscience should be so tenderly scrupulous about that which was his aduersaries sinne, and none of his owne?

4 Secondly consider *What* the doubt and difficulty is, which the *Friend* of *M. Parsons* doth desire so earnestly to be decided: The only thing that he would know (poore soule) is, whether when a lawfull Magistrate proceedeth iudicially

cially in examination vpon Oath, it may be held *Tollerable* for any to abuse and delude this Iudge by *Equiuocating* in Oath, or no? But shal we thinke that *M. Parsons* his friend or any Christian would make question and doubt whether that be *Tollerable*, which euery conscience of man, yea of the very Pagans, by the onely light and instinct of Nature, can presently condemne as most *intollerable*? Would he haue vs to thinke that his *Friend* could be so sottish as to make question about a point so vtterly vnquestionable?

5 Thirdly, *Whether* now will his *Friend* trauell for meanes to remoue this great perplexity? We see that he now posteth ouer the *Alpes* as far as *Rome*, by his letters, for satisfaction in this case. But what? *Is there no balme in Gilead*? Is there no sufficient Counsaile in any Iesuit, or secular Priest within *England*, that can resolute this so silly and sencelesse a doubt? and to vntwine so loose a thred? Shall we thinke this probable?

6 Lastly, when all is done, *Whome* will the good man make choise of in *Rome*, for the determiner of this point? whom, but his friend *M. Parsons*? and good reason, because
 * *It seemed* (saith *M. Parsons*) *that he had some right to urge me in this matter, in respect of the Treatise written by me of that matter against M. Morton, and I thought my selfe the more bound to yeeld him some satisfaction to his demand.* But how could his *Friend* be ignorant of *M. Parsons* his iudgement in such a Case? We may trie this by his last Conclusion. * *I doe infer* (saith *M. Parsons*) *for resolution of the case, that this was no true, or proper Equiuocation at all, but rather a flat lie, and open perinry; as by that we haue treated before with M. Morton in the second chapter of this booke may appeare more largely: but much more throughout diuers Chapters together in my former Treatise of Mitigation.* Let vs put his former Reason and this Conclusion together, and hence I *infer* a notable absurditie, viz. that *Master Parsons* his *Friend* must bethought to haue sent many hundred miles vnto *M. Parsons*, to answer a doubt by his letters, which he had

* *Reckon.*
See above.

* *Reckon* p. 674.

M. Parsons
 conuicted, by
 his owne
 mouth.

had largely and sufficiently vnfolded and assoiled publicly by his booke a yeere before.

7 These fower particular circumstances, viz. 1 *Who*; 2 *What*; 3 *Whither*; 4 and *Whom*, implying these fower *Improbabilities*, the 1. to seeke to be informed in conscience concerning a sinne, that did not concerne him: the 2. about a *Case*, wherein there could be no doubt: the 3. by delaying time, and consulting farre off, whereas he might haue beene presently resolved at home: and 4. in vrging *M. Parsons* to satisfie that, which he had satisfied; do all (in my apprehension more then coniecturally tell vs, that this *Case* was deuised either by *M. Parsons* his friend, or else by himselfe, rather than deriued from the practise of any Protestant. And this will be found to be not onely (as in this *Exordium*) probable, but euen demonstrable, by examination of the Narration it selfe.

The Narration of the pretended Equiuocating Case of York-shire.

The Case then in effect was this. A certaine Minister in York-shire named Wh. (for I thinke not good to set downe all the letters thereof) dwelling at a towne called Thornley, if I misse not the name. Reck pag. 672.

The Reuiew, shewing the manifold falshoods of this declaration.

8 Vpon the discouery of the falshoods of this Narration, it will easily appeare that *M. Parsons* had rather cause to blush at the noting of the two first letters of the *Ministers* name, then the *Minister* himselfe need to be ashamed, to be named to the full, who is willing to reueale himselfe to bee that *Ed. Wortakers*, Rector of the Parsonage of *Thornhill* (for that is the right name of the place) who had a sute with *M. C.* about the Tirche of a Crosse: but how? *M. Parsons* hath related the Case in the behalfe of the *Defendant*, shall not wee

be heard ſpeak for the Plaintiffe? *Qui partem alteram audis, parte inaudita altera, (ſaith Seneca) iniquus eris, aequum licet iudicaueris*: that is; *Hee that in iudgement heareth one partie ſpeake, and neglecteth the other, albeit he happen to iudge juſtly, yet is he an vniuſt Iudge.* Now then behold we the firſt vntueth of this fabulous deuife.

M. PARSONS his Appendix.

Reck. *ibid.*

He being married and loaden with many children, and thereupon not content with the ordinary Tithes, that were woont to be giuen, and paid in that Pariſh:

The Review.

9 This is ſpoken to make the Miniſter ſeeme to haue been a man contentious, who notwithstanding dare profeſſe of himſelfe, that for *Thirtie yeeres ſpace*, (for ſo long hath he beene Rector of that Parſonage) hee troubled not any of his Pariſhoners for Tithes, except the now queſtioned. M^r C. and that eſpecially for the Tithes of one Cloſſe. From this he paſſeth to another vntueth.

M. PARSONS his Appendix.

Page 672.

He began to urge one of his Pariſhioners to pay him other Tithes alſo out of a certaine Cloſſe or Field that was pretended not to haue paid Tithes before to other precedent Incumbents. Whereupon this Miniſter deuizing with himſelfe, how he might further his owne cauſe, reſolved upon this meane, among others, to deale with another Miniſter, which immediately before had poſſeſſed that Benefice, intreating him aſwell by requeſt, as by offering him a piece of money (as hiſher is written) to aſſiſt him in this behalfe, by lending him the aid of an oath, that he had receiued Tithes before that time out of that Cloſſe or Field.

The Review.

10 The Playntiffe answereth, that The Miniſter, which immediately

immediately before had possessed that *Benefice*, was dead, before I was instituted vnto it; being about twenty yeeres, before this action began. Therefore *M. Parsons*, without a miracle of raising the dead man vnto life, could not make good this part of his accusation. But he goeth on audaciously, without feare of other pits of errorrs and fallhoods, which are in his way. The third followeth.

M. PARSONS his Appendix.

Whereat though for a time the second Minister did seeme to *Reck. ibid.* stick much, saying that he could not doe it with the peace of his conscience; yet afterward it seemeth by the earnest perswasion & inductions of the other Minister, his repugnance of conscience was so mortified, as hee yeilded to the others intreaty; especially for that he told him him he had so great friendship and acquaintance with those that must be Iudges and examiners of the cause at *Yorke*, as he doubted not but their two oathes would carie it away.

The Review.

31 *M. Parsons* had a great minde to bring some Minister vpon the stage for all spectators to point at him, inso-much that he hath fancied such a man to be that Minister, as was dead and buried twenty yeeres before the beginning of this Sute, as was said. And now the Plaintiffe furthermore answereth, that No Minister was ever used in this cause, either as witnesse or as aider, or any way else. But it is knowne what a Priestly Itch *M. Parsons* had to traduce Ministers: which kinde of dealing might proceed from a Conscience that was *mortua*, but not *mortificata*. Although these former fallhoods may much preiudice *M. Parsons* his Report; yet shall I desire my Reader to forget these circumstances, and to iudge according to the issue of the Case it selfe, for now we lanch into the maine.

M. PARSONS his Appendix.

Reckon. p. 673. To Yorke Assises then they went, where having taken their Oathes, and pleaded the case,

The Review.

The Trans-
parency of
the forgery.

12 Then, belike, both the Ministers did Take their Oathes in this Case: but the one did not swear, neither, indeed, could he swear by the law of nature, because he was dead; and the other could not swear by the order of the Common-law of the land, which admitteth none in those Courts to swear in his owne Cause. Which Circumstance maketh the forgery of this Case to be such a *Pellucidum mendacium*, that is, so transparent an vntruth, that a man may see thorow it. But we haue longed all this while to heare the issue of this cause, and what successe it had.

M. PARSONS his Appendix.

Reckon. ibid.

At length they found not that successe, which they expected: for that the whole Towne and Parish of Thornley offering themselves confidently to swear and depose the contrary in behalfe of the Defendant (to wit, that Tithes were not accustomed to be passed out of that place) the Ministers had sentence given against them, with no small note of publike periury.

The Review.

13 The fower former falsehoods were notable, but this, as the Master-lie, exceedeth them all: for at the Assises at Yorke, when the *Nisi-prisus* betweene *M. Whit.* and *M. Co.* was to be tried, and verduict ready to be giuen *M. Co.* was *Non-sute*, and afterwards sought for an other *Prohibition*, still to hinder the Rectors proceedings. The truth heereof I haue confirmed not only by *M. Whit.* his protestation, but also

also by the most credible testimony as wel of the then Iudge in the Court of *Yorke*, who kept a note of the passages in this cause, as of a Counsaillor at Law, of *M. Co.* his part, who aduised his Clyent to forbear that course of prosecution. The wisdome of which his Counsaile was largely verified by the event. I forbear to mention a publike Instrument vnder seale, which noteth that *M. C.* sought for a Prohibition against *M. Whit.* after the Assises at *Yorke*. We may guesse what complection *M. Parsons* his friend was of, who blushed not to say, that *M. Whit.* had sentence giuen against him at *Yorke*. Furthermore, because *M. Parsons* hath aduentured to talke of *Successe*, I should it not inconuenient to adde as followeth.

The memorableness of the Suite betweene *M. Whit.* and *M. Co.* about the *Tithe* of that *Closse*, and the *Successe* of the whole businesse.

14 It was to be sentenced before the Ordinary at *Yorke*, but before the sentence was pronounced, *M. C.* got a Prohibition at *London*, wherein *M. Whit.* obtained a Consultation, because *M. C.* had been *Non-suit* in a former Prohibition at *Yorke*. Neuerthelesse he procured a third Prohibition, & was againe by another Consultation remitted to his Ordinary at *Yorke*. He stirreth vp to *London* for a fourth Prohibition, and after that, a fifth and a sixt; which were all frustrated by so many Consultations, because he failed to make dew prooffe of his Suggestions, within the times limited by the Statute. After the three last Prohibitions he procured an Iniunction out of the Chauncery against *M. Whit.* but vpon Information giuen to the Court it was speedily dissolved. Is not this a strange case, which continuing the space of nine yeeres, was so often tossed like a Tennis-bal between *London* and *Yorke*? But in the end the matter was so vexatiously

¹ Prohib. (by Iudge Popham) dat. 8. Feb. An. R. R. Eliz. 37. Out of the Kings Bench. And a Consult. (Popham) Dat. 7. May An. Reg. Eliz. 39. ² Prohib. (Iud. Anderson) 30. Jan. An. Eliz. 40. out of the Common-Pleas. And then a Consultation Dat. 24. May, An. 40. Eliz. ³ Prohib. (Iud. Popham) 5. Iulij An. Eliz. 40. out of the Kings Bench. And then a Consultation by Iudge Popham, Dat. 12. Feb. An. 41. Eliz. ⁴ Prohib. (Iud. Anderson) Dat. 23. Jan. An. Eliz. 44. And a Consult. 14. May, Anno. Eliz. 44. ⁵ Prohib. (Iud. Anderson) Dat. 23. Iulij, An. 44. Eliz. & Consult. Dat. 3. Nouem. An. Eliz. 44. ⁶ Prohib. or Superedeas (Iud. Anders.) Dat. 12. Feb. An. Eliz. 45. And yet was there granted a Consult. Dat. 27. May, Reg. Lat. An. 1. by Iudge Anderson.

The successe
of the cause.

tionously caried on M. C. his part, as that he was taxed to pay 300. pounds costs, whereof M. *Whit.* received two hundred pounds, and after that his foresaid Tithes, and hath enioied them euer since. Heere we see not onely one *Successe*, but euen as many successes as there were *Consultations*, which were six; and as there were pounds, which he got for charges, amounting to aboute two hundred pounds; and as the valew of the Tiche is, which he recouered. And now let them laugh that winne: for heerein we see this Prouerbe falsified. Notwithstanding *M. Parsons* still boasteth and maketh sport in behalfe of his *Defendant*, and plaieth merily vpon a slanderous figment, as followeth.

M. PARSONS his Appendix.

Reck. pag. 673. One that was a particular friend of M. *Wh.* demanding the reason how they could sweare, or rather forswear in such maner, the thing being knowne to be so notoriously false? He answered, that they in their owne sence did sweare truly (behold then the Case of Equiuocation) and that so they were ready to prooue it, if they had beene urged by the Iudges therein, to wit, that their meaning in swearing was, that the former Incumbent had receiued Tithes out of that Crosse or Field, or without that Crosse or Field, namely, in other Crosse adioyning, though not in the Field. And with this Equiuocation of (Out) and (In) they thought themselues cleared, both for deceiuing the Iudges, and their *Parishioners*.

The Renew.

15 This, in his marginall note, he calleth a *fraudulens* and *lying Equiuocation*: who, if he be aliue, might be put in minde by a most graue, godly, & famous Treasurer of learning *Sir Tho. B.* that there was such a iest as this set abroad in *M. Parsons* his time in *Oxford*, by one, who merily maintained that the testimonie, which he alleaged, was out of *Aristotle*; that is not credible (said his fellow:) the other brought

brought for his defence, a booke which was not *Aristotle*, where the alleaged testimonie was extant, and therefore (said the Sophister) is it found out of *Aristotle*. May we not thinke that *M. Parsons* hath turned a iest into an earnest, and translated the booke-case into the *Cloſe-case*?

16 When we remember the diuerſe improbabilites in the *A Recapitulation.*
Exordium, of a friend busily inquiring about a sinne, which did not concerne him; and questioning about such a *Case*, which no Christian could doubt of; and sending for resolution to *Rome*, which might haue beene had at home; and consulting thereabout with *M. Parsons* by priuate letters, which had been before largely ſatisſied in his publike books: but eſpecially when we recognize the falſities of the *Narration* and *Declaration* it ſelfe, wherein a *Minister* is made a witneſſe, who was dead twenty yeeres before; and ſome *Minister* is objected, whereas no *Minister* was any way vſed in that cauſe; and they are ſaid to haue beene *forſworne*, who were not, nor could not be ſworne; and the ſentence is affirmed to paſſe with him at the *Aſſiſes*, who was ſo ſuccelleſſe as to become *Non-ſute*, and ſo to forſake his cauſe, and in the vp-ſhot was conſtrained both to pay the Tithes that were ſued for, and to repay the charges of the ſute: How can we but thinke that this *Equiuocating* by out and in, came out of *M. Parsons* his Equiuocating braine, wherein the *Mitigation*, for defence of a woofe kinde of *Equiuocation*, by *Mentall Reſervation*, was formerly ingendred? What remaineth now, but that we vnderſtand what *Determination* *M. Parsons* hath paſſed vpon this forged *Caſe*?

The Conclusion and determination of the former Caſe.

M. PARSONS his Appendix.

Their Conſpiracie together, by way of money, corruption, and bribes, was deteſtable. Their guilefull deceiuing, their lawfull *Reck. pa. 673.*
Indiges, that were competent in the cauſe, and proceeded invidi- *674.*

The resolution of the case *cally, was abhominable. The scandall given to them that knew they swore falsely, was impious. The obligation they had to answer directly vnto the sense and meaning of the said Iudges, was indispensable: all which points are different in a lawfull Equivocation. Whereof I doe inferre, for resolution of the case, that this was no true or proper Equivocation at all, but rather a flat lie, and open periury.*

The Review.

*See above.

17 Although such a speech (in iudgement) being but a *Verball Equivocation* in the inward court of a mans conscience, might goe for an indirect truth, as hath been *prooued yet in *foro fori*, and outward court of mans Iudicature, wherein the secret thoughts of men cannot be discerned, it may be censured for a lie. And whether it be a lie, or not a lie, yet being a deceit and delusion against a Magistrate in an Oath, none can deny but euery such practise is *Detestable abhominable, indispensable, and impious* both before God and man. And thus far (supposing that the case had beene such) I yeeld vnto *M. Parsons* his Censure and Conclusion.

18 But now, after the examination of the Third part of his Accusation, I cannot see how *M. Parsons* could haue chosen a more extraordinary and famous case, wherein to betray their owne malice against *Ministers*, and to make themselves most notoriously infamous, by deuising this Equivocation of *out* and *in*, which may perswade any indifferent Reader to crie *out* vpon such dealing, and to retort his Rhetorique vpon our Aduersaries, saying that such their *guilefull* defaming of Protestants is *detestable*, their objecting of *periury*, where there was not so much as an Oath, is *abhominable*, their abusing of their Readers credulity is *impious*; their transgression against their owne Conscience is *indispensable*; and whatsoever *lie* there is in it is to be attributed not to the supposed Actor, but to the suspected Author and Iuener thereof.

19 Finally, for asmuch as our Aduersaries will seeme to make

make such kinde of Equiuocating hateful; it might haue become them to haue condemned their owne Mint and Doctrine of Equiuocating, before that they had slandered others by false accusation in that, whereof some of themselves stand conuicted, by the the confessions of their owne fellowes; as now, by occasion of *M. Parsons* his Challenge I am vrged to discouer.

A Confutation of *M. PARSONS* his prooffe of *Mental Equiuocation* taken from the speeches of *Christ*, in *Ioh. 8.* vpon an occasion, which he tooke at *D. Kings Sermon*.

§. II.

M. PARSONS his Appendix, and Challenge.

I would demand of this new Prachant-Minister, that is so Recken, ps. 675. beate and vehement in his calumination, when he, or his can prooue that any one Iesuite in the world amongst so many thousands as are extant, hath euer practised, patronised, published, or perswaded any such Equiuocation as this, which was used by the Ministers of Yorkeshire? When would either Master Southwell, or M. Garnet, whom they are wont to accuse for this doctrine, haue taken such an oath for deceiuing of their Neighbours, as those Ministers did? Was this out of the infirmity of the flesh, and pusillanimity, or rather out of couetousnesse and iniquity? Was it with the faces of Hierusalem and Iudah, or not rather of Sodome and Gomorrah?

The Reuiew, yeelding confessed Examples
of Iesuiticall practize, in lying
Equiuocations.

20 Thus the old man still venteth his choler adust, raging, and reuiling a learned *Doctor*, whose studies haue soared somewhat about *M. Parsons* his reach: whom if he may

teame a *Prachant Minister*, then may we verily thinke that there is no *Preaching Priest* amongst the Romanists. But we leaue comparisons. *M. Parsons* is therefore so bitter against him, because he thought their Equiuocators do carrie the faces of *Sodome and Gomorrha* by patronizing, publishing, and perswading the whole world the lawfulnessse of their *Heterogenious*, and *inragrill* propositions; who from hencefoorth (said he) may ease the inhabitants of *Crete* from their deserued infamie, which the *Apostle* laieth upon them, that the *Cretensians* are *lyars*, &c. These speeches *M. Parsons* calleth hot and vehement calumniation, exorbitant outcries, idle inuectiues, and flat lies: And in the end exacteth of him an answer vnto his reasons, for the defence of the Art of Equiuocating, which are set downe in the *Mitigation*. In the which challenge who seeth not there is more windy ostentation, then sober discretion; if either he considered the admirable, and indeed (in his kinde) kingly woorthinesse of that our *Doctor*; or the vntempered morter, wherewith *M. Parsons* hath dawbed vp a defence of his mentall Equiuocation, euen by reason of the mixture of absurditie and impietie, whereof they consist? As may be seene especially in his reason taken from the examples of *Christ* in Scripture. But first he desireth to be satisfied in some Iesuiticall examples of like nature.

21 If I should propound the example of their *Priest*, who being deprehended and conuicted before a Magistrate, and asked whether he were a *Priest* or not? Answered *no*, meaning, *No Priest of Apollo*: secondly, whether he had been beyond the *Sea*, or no? Answered, *No*, meaning the *Adriatique Sea*; or other such like *Delphicall* euasions vsed by *M. Garnet* in his examinations, which were so vgly, that the *Examiners* were thereby driuen into woonder and horror; *M. Parsons* or some for him would readily reply that the *Magistrats* in *England* are no competent Iudges of their *Priests*; and that in so great an hazard, as was his libertie, or life, hee might lawfully Equiuocate. But I* haue already prooued, that the authoritie of our *Magistrates* over a *Priest* is most iust: And it is also without question, that a man is no more priuiledged

* See aboue,
lib. 1. ca. 3. §. 5.

privileged to Equiuocate, in danger of losse of libertie, or of life, then of goods; and therefore if *M. Parsons* could condemne the Equiuocation of out and in for a lie, then this Equiuocation of a Priest Romish, and a Priest Apollonist, may not passe currant for truth.

22 But what need we our owne collection, for the manifestation of their Iesuiticall delusions, seeing that we may be sufficiently enabled hereunto by our aduertaries confessions? We haue often heard of the complaint of a College of Romish^e Priests against *M. Parsons* for his coosenage, and crueltye against some English Messengers, which were sent from them vnto the Pope: rogether with a description of *M. Parsons* his former disposition, which was *To cogge and Equiuocate at enery word.*

^b See aboue, lib. 1. cap. 1. num. 28.

23 Besides this, their Quodlibettarian Priest declameth against the Iesuits, because of their *Abuse of Equiuocation, making it indeed* (saith he) *nothing but an Art of lying, cogging and foisting, and that without all respect of matter, time, or place; and consequently tending vnto flat Atheisme: So that* (saith he) *it shall be as hard to conuince them of any errors in matters of faith, as it was to conuince Arius, who subscribing to the Councels decrees, swearing that it was true, as it there was written, (meaning in the paper kept close in his bosome, or sleene) iust like to the Iesuits Equiuocating, or counterfeited perinuries.* And, for example, hee bringeth in one *James Standish* a Iesuit Priest, who abused the Pope; when being asked of his Holinesse, whether the matter of the setting up of the Hierarchie in England was done by the consent of all the rest of the Priests in England, or not? answered, (but falsely, for scarce one of the secular Priests in England, in respect of the whole number, knew of it) that, [It was,] referring to himselfe this part, *vz. [As I presuppose, or presume:] as since he hath confessed.* And the like practise of Iesuits hethere noteth with *Cal. Caietane*, in offering his Lordship the names of Priests, as consenting to that which they did not, and excusing the matter by their secret reseruatiou, scil. *If all would consent. Can any presume that they will feare by Equiuocating to abuse their*

^c Quodlib. pag. 32. & 33.

Examples of Equiuocating Romish Priests.

^d lb. pag. 66.

neighbours, who make so bold to collude with their ghostly father, and supreme Pastor, the Pope?

24 By this we finde, that there is, in this point of Equiuocating, some oddes betweene the honestie of Protestants, and Romarists, seeing that *M. Parsons* could not produce an example of any one Protestant, who hath so equiuocated; except that of *Out*, and *In*, which (vpon due examination) appeareth to haue bene either the lying suggestion of his friend, or else the false inuention and forgery of his owne braine. And who is there among all Protestants that euer put pen to paper, to iustifie *M. Parsons* maner of *Mentall Reseruation*? But as for our Aduersaries, their profession herein is so rancke, and their practice so rife, that one of their owne brotherhood had cryed out vpon their lyes and coggeries. Yet this deuellish Doctrine were lesse dangerous, if it did not transforme it selfe into the resemblance of more than an *Angell of light*, by pretending the example of our *Blessed Saviour Christ*, as followeth.

CHAP. X.

Short answers vnto the particular Instances, which M. PARSONS vsed out of 8. chap. of S. Iohn, for colour of their Romish Equiuocation. And first by way of Introduction.

§. I.

M. PARSONS his Appendix.

Reck. pag. 682.



Finde the speeches of our Saviour so frequent euery where in this maner of concealing of secrecies, or things not fit to be plainly vttered, by this doubtful and ambiguous kinde of speech, as in one onely chapter of S. Iohns Gospell, I finde Christ to haue vsed the same a bene 7. or 8. times at least setting downe certaine propositions, that

1042.

that of themselves, and as they lie, are in the common Hearers ears false, though true in the speakers meaning, by some *Mentall Reservation*. Which Reservation though he uttered not in words yet is necessarily understood: and this is properly *Equivocation* in our sense and Doctrine.

The Reuiew, shewing the distinction betweene Verball, and Mentall Equivocation.

1 It is fit, before we seeke to satisfie others, that first we labour to understand our selues, by setting downe the true differences which are betweene vs. To this end I distinguish of *Equivocation*, or *Amphibology* (as they are largely taken) into *Verball*, and *Mentall*.

2 The *Verball* is (as hath beene said) when any speech hath diuerse ambiguous and doubtfull senses, according to the outward vse of the words in themselves, and not only by the inward reservation of the minde: which doubtfulness of a speech consisteth sometime in one word, sometime in a whole sentence.

3 An example of the *Verball Equivocation*, or ambiguity of speech in one word, may be these: one spying a man of little wit, and perceiuing that he had big and strong legges, said that he was a man of good understanding; wittily changing the more vsuall sense of the word, *Understanding*, as it signifieth wit and iudgement, into the lesse common acceptation thereof, wherein it agreed vnto a mans legges. Not much different was the answer of a Market-man vnto one, who being desirous to know what prices good horses bare, asked him, *How goe Horses at the faire?* Sir (quoth he) *some amble, and some trot*; merrily playing vpon the verball ambiguity of the word, *Go*.

4 As there is a *Verball Amphibology*, and doubtfull sense in particular words, so is there also in the composition of whole sentences, and that in infinite varieties; as it happeneth often by the diuerse disposall of the word of a speech. As when the man said that he met this morning a cart full of
stones

stones empty: which words, taken according to the common reading, doe yeelde no sence, but that which is sencelesse; but being rightly distinguished, it is the same, as if he had said: *I empty*, (that is, fasting) *this morning met a Court*. Or as an other affirmed, saying, *I saw Paulus sleepe on horsebacke*; meaning, that *being on horsebacke, he saw Paulus sleepe*.

5. But of all *Tropes*, or figures in Rhetorique, there is none that cometh nearer vnto *Mentall Reseruation* than doe these two, *Ironia*, and *Apiosopesis*: For first in *Ironia*, or iesting and derision, the meaning, which is conueyed by the words, sometimes is quite contrary vnto the naturall proprietie of the words themselves: as may be decerned in that contention, which the Prophet *Eliab* had with *Baals* Priests, wherein he is^a said to haue *mocked the Priests of Baal, saying to them, Cry aloud; for he is a God, either he talketh, or pursueth his enemies, or is in his journey, or else it may be he is a sleepe, and must be waked*. But in this there was not Romish *Mentall Reseruation*, which lurketh wholly in the closet of the speakers brest; but a *Verball ambiguitie*, wherof the hearer was capable; to vnderstand that the Prophet now contending against *Baal*, to proue him to be no God, did meane, by calling him *God*, and attributing vnto him properties, which cannot agree vnto *God* (as *talking, journeying, sleeping*) but to scorne & deride him, and indeed to call him *No God*. Like hereunto was the Answer which the Prophet *Michaiah* made vnto *Ahab*, when he answered him, saying,^b *Goe up to Ramath Gilead, and prosper*: which Ironie the King himselfe perceiued right well; whereby the Prophet (saith^c *Madonate*) did not deceiue him, but sheweth that he was deceiued.

6. The 2. figure, which can best claime any alliance with *Mentall Reseruation*, is *Apiosopesis*, or *Reticentia*, which *M. Parsons* bringeth in to patterne their Romish *Reseruation*. This is such a speech, as is abruptly broken off in the halfe. We haue an example in the 3. of *Gen.* where God now casting *Adam* out of Paradise, saith, *But now lest man doe put forth his hand. and take also of the tree of life, and eate and liue for ever*; Reseruing the rest, but not as inconceivable vnto

^a 1. Reg. 18.

^b Ibid. cap. 22.

^c In Luc. vii. vers. 18.

^d Gen. 22.

unto the Reader, which in the generalitie was this. I will take another order with him. For here, by a knowne figure, called *Anthropomorphia*, God is brought in to speake like a man, when he is in anger and passion: Now the voice of mans extreame passion and perturbation is alwaies abrupt and broken, even as he is described by the Poet to say; *Quos Virg. ego.* Which kinde of sentences doe, according to the fashion of mans speech, betoken the intendment of some kinde of reuenge, and cannot any whit countenance the Romish *Mentall Reservation*, which is not all implied in the outward forme of the speech, as we shall presently demonstrate.

That the Scripture alloweth not the
Romish *Reservation*.

§. 2.

7. *S. Augustine* (as he is cited by the Iesuite *Salmeron*) ^{4 Salmeron} saith that Scriptures, because they speake unto men, doe use no ^{1. Ies. Tom. 1. Pro-} kinde of speech, which is not usuall among men. Whereby I ^{legom. 12. Can.} make bold to assume, that there is no speech in Scripture, ^{15. ex Aug.} whether it be proper or figuratiue, but it accordeth vnto ^{Tom. 3. li 1. de} the vse of the outward words and the meaning may possibly ^{Trim. cap. 12.} be apprehended by an intelligent Reader, who can iustly obserue the phrase of speech, and the due circumstances thereof. As for *M. Parsons* his *Mentall Reservation* it is inapprehensible, because he saith that ^{• Mitig. cap. 8.} *The clause of Reservation may be what is pleaseth a man; and whatsoever he list to* ^{pag. 344.} *frame to himselfe: so that it agree with his minde, in a cause wherein he is not bound to make any direct Answer. For example sake, let vs take this: If a Priest being asked by a Protestant Magistrate vnto whom hee thinketh he is not bound to answer directly whether he be an Aoynted Priest? and shall answer, saying; I am not an aoynted Priest, secretly refering this clause in my minde, not Aoynted, on my elbows, or not Aoynted with Tarre or Oyle de Baye: is not this reservation mecrely Mentall, and no-way implied in the*

R r

outward

outward speech, but vnsearchable, and altogether degenerate from the proper or figurative vse of mans speech? Can he possibly find vs any colour for this Art of falshood, and coggery, out of the Gospell of truth.

The Examination of places of Scripture, objected by M. PARSONS out of *Iohn 8.*

The first is out of the *vers. 15.*

§. III.

M. PARSONS his Appendix.

• *Reck. pa. 683.* The place then which I meane is the 8. chapter of S. Iohns Gospell, where Christ our Sauour entring into a large speech with the Iewes, vseth first these words, which I haue examined before in my said Treatise of Equiuocation: *Ego non iudico quenquam, I doe not iudge any man: which seeming to be contrary to that other saying of himselfe within a very few lines, in the same Chapter, I haue many things to speake, and iudge of you: and further in the same Gospell three Chapters before; For neither doth my Father iudge any man, but hath giuen to me his Sonne all iudgement: it doth not appeare how the proposition can be true, but by some mentall reseruation in the minde of our Sauour; which being examined by the ancient Fathers what it might be, S. Chrysostom with Leontius Theophilus, and others doe thinke the said secret meaning or Reseruation of our Sauour to haue bene this: I doe not iudge any man in this my first coming, but doe reserue it for my next at the day of iudgement. Other Fathers gather another, as though he had secretly ment: I doe not iudge any man, as you the Scribes and Pharisees doe, according to the flesh, and outward shew, but in trueth: Yet neither of these Reservations being uttered, they doe make the speech to be ambiguous and Equiuocall, as cannot be denied.*

The Review.

8 There is no *Mentall Reservation* in this speech of *Christ*, which the outward words themselves doe not imply; for if we vnderstand the sentence, [*I doe iudge no man*] according to the first exposition, which signifieth that he did not now iudge men, in this life, it is explicable enough by this and other Scriptures: For elsewhere it is plaine that he came into the world as a *Iesus*, to *Save the world*, and not as a Iudge, to condemne it. And to this purpose the text saith (as *Caio-^{In hunc locum.}* tane obserueth) *Non iudico*, not, *Non iudicabo*, that is, *I iudge no man*, it saith not, *I will iudge no man*, so that there is no shadow of Repugnancie in this with the other speeches of *Christ*.

9 Again if the second exposition be consulted with, concerning the manner of iudgement, it doth not exclude the former; and is also sufficiently apparent by the outward words: for in the words going before, he told the *Pharisees*, saying, *You iudge according to the flesh*; but *I iudge no man*, namely (*ἀνὸρ τῆς σαρκὸς* saith *Maddomato*) according to *the flesh*, whereby *Christ* distinguisheth his manner of iudgement from the *Pharisees*; because they, as men, iudged *According to the flesh*, that is, (as *Tolet* expoundeth) according to external & outward sence: but *Christ* iudgeth immediately, without helpe of sence, and is therefore God. We see then that the sence of *Christ* his speech was intelligible, by vertue of the words themselves: But the sence of the *Priest* is not so, for if he shall say, *I am no Priest*, meaning of the old law, is there any wit of man that can diue into the depth of this *Reservation*?

The second place, *vers. 32.*

M. PARSONS Appendix.

In the same place he saith to the Iewes: If you perseuere in Reckon. p. 123.
my sayings, you shall truly be my Disciples, and know the

Rr 2

truth,

truth, and the truth shall free you: Which freedom, or deliv-
erance the Jewes understood from temporall bondage: and
therefore answered him, that they were the seede of Abra-
ham, and had neuer beene in bondage to any. Which error
of the Jewes proceeded from the ambiguous speech of our Savi-
our, reserving in his minde, and not expressing in his proposition
what bondage he meant: for that his reserved meaning indeede
was of the bondage of sinne,

The review.

10 There was a Verbal ambiguitie, because there is a dou-
ble freedom, the one from corporal bondage, the other from
Spiritual, as from sin and hell. The Jewes spake of the one,
Christ diuerteth their thoughts to the consideration of the
other, and explaineth his owne meaning in the 24. verse;
He that sinneth is the servant of sinne: As if he had said (saith
Card.¹ Caietane) Behold what the servitude is, whereof I
speak, &c. Which is a case familiar euen vnto the Pagans
themselves (as their Bishop¹ Iansenius well noteth); inso much
that Diogenes vsed to say that There is no difference betweene
Servants, and vicious Lords, but the vowels and Syllables of their
names, except onely this, that servants doe serue their Lords,
and Lords are slaves to their owne vicious affections. This be-
ing so conceiuable a fence of these words, freedom, and ser-
uitude, euen by the common vse of the outward words them-
selves among men, how can it confirme a Mentall Restruc-
tion, which is such a Couchant in mens harts, as which by
no vse of the outward speech can possibly be decerned; as
when a man shall say, I am no Priest; conceiuing in minde
this clause, With a Club-foote.

¹ In eum locum.

¹ Iansen. Con-
cord. Euang.
aund. locum.

The third place is out of vers. 50.

M. PARSONS Appendix.

Reken pag. 684. The like may be observed in those words; Ego non quæro
gloriam meam, I doe not seek my glory; and yet doth Christ
most

most iustly seeke his owne glory that is due vnto him: and so in the verse immediately going before he obiecteth this vnto them, Vos inhorastis me: you haue dishonoured me; and in another place to his Disciples he saith, Vos vocastis me Mr. & Dom: - Iohn 13. v. 13. ne. & bene dicitis, sum etenim. You haue called me Master and Lord, and doe well therein, for that I am your Master and Lord indeede. And in another place, Creditis in Deum, & in me credite, You doe beleene in God, beleene also in me, which is the highest honour he could exact: And consequently there must needs be some Mentall Reseruation in this other speech, when he saith, he seeketh not his owne glory, which the Fathers doe indenuour to seeke out in their Commentaries.

The Reuiew.

11 This is a Verball Equiuocation in the word, *Glory*, admitting a double fence, one is the Glory of his Office, so in the other places objected, but in this place it is taken for the glory of *Reuenge*, as the words which immediately go before and which follow immediately after doe import: for before it is said, *You haue dishonoured me, but I seeke not mine owne glory*, that is, *Vindicta*, to take vengeance vpon you: As their owne Authors *Toler*, *Salmeron*, *Maldonate*, and *Lanctm* doe acknowledge. What then? shall they be therefore vnpunished? No, for it followeth in the same verse, *There is one* (that is, the Father) *that seeketh and iudgeth*, that is, *Reuengeth*, saith their *Maldonate*. How can this Verball Equiuocation, which is exlicable enough, by the force of the outward words of the same vers, countenance the vnsearchable depth of their *Mentall Reseruation*, such as is this; *I haue no head*, referring in my thought, *horned like an Oxe*.

Upon this place.

The fourth place is out of the vers. 51.

M. PARSONS his Appendix.

It followeth in the same place? Amen, Amen. I say vnto you *Recken. pa. 684.* if any obserue my words, he shall neuer see death: Which the Scribes and Pharisees, (though otherwise learned in their law) vers. 51.

Rr 3

under.

understood of corporall death, and in that sense gave an instance of Abraham, and the Prophets that were dead, notwithstanding they had observed the words and commandments of God, and consequently in their sense Christs sentence could not be true: but our Saviour had another intention and meaning reserved in his minde, by which reservation the truth of the sentence was iustified, to wit, that they should not die in soule.

The Review.

12 This is a Verball Equivocation in the word, *Death*, which in it selfe doth equally signifie a *Temporall*, and an *Eternall* death: but in this place is applied only to the *Eternall*, as may appeare by the Text, *He shall not see death in eternum*, that is, *everlastingly*. For these words, in *eternum* (saith ^{1 In hunc locum.} *Casotane*) are added, to distinguish it from the *temporall* Death: and so also doe their *Tolst*, *Maldonate*, and *Salmeron* expound it. By vertue of the which word, *Everlastingly*, the foresaid meaning of the speech is made intelligible; And is therefore iniuriously produced for the iustification of his *Mentall Reservation*, which is vncomprehensible, because it lurketh in the bottomlesse pit of mans secret thought, as for example to say; *I have not my Crowne shaven* (reserving in my minde as followeth:) *With a paire of Pincers.*

The fifth place, Vers. 54.

M. PARSONS his Appendix.

^{Rechen ps. 684.} ^{685.} It followeth yet further in the same place: If I do glorifie my selfe (saith Christ) my glory is nothing: Which yet I thinke no man will grant to be true according to the letter, as it lieth. For albeit Christ should set forth his owne glory, yet may it not be said, that this glory published by himselfe is nothing, or vaine. Wherefore some reserved sense must beere also be sought out, which according to the opinion of sundry expositors is that he meant this according to the opinion the *Iewes*, who esteemed that nothing

nothing which came from Christ himselfe. As also a little before in the 5. chap. he used the like speech, saying, If I beare witness of my selfe, my witness is not true. Which sentence I thinke our Ministers themselves will not hold to be true in the sense, which here it beareth: for then should they condemne our Saviour of falsity, as often as he affirmeth any thing of himselfe: and then must we of necessity run to some reserved sense in Christs meaning, which is the thing that we call Equivocation, so reviled by our Ministers.

The Review.

13 Their Iesuit * Salmeron publisheth this for a Canon, * Salmeron.
for the direction of every Reader of Scripture, viz. that some-
time. It was the fashion of Christ, in giving Answers unto men, *1st. Tom. 1.*
to accomodate and apply his speech rather unto their meanings, *Prolegom. 11.*
than to their words: and for example thereof he produceth
the second place which now M. Parsons alleageth, taken out
of the 5. chapter of S. Iohn, vers. 31. If I beare witness of my
selfe, my witness is not true: That is (saith he) according to your
understanding, who take me to be a mere man. And of the first
place, concerning the Glorifying of himselfe, M. Parsons con-
fesseth that Christ spake according to the opinion of the Jewes;
or, as saith * Iansenius, this sentence is to be understood as others * Iansen. Con-
be, as if he had said, If I as a man (according to the opinion which cord. in eund.
you have of me) doe glorifie my selfe, my glory were but vaine. *locum. Ioh. 8.*
which sheweth that in the speech of Christ the Equivoca-
tion was only Verball, in the word, Glorifie, which of it selfe
might signifie a iust and diuine glorifying of himselfe, as he
was the sonne of God, which was not intended in this place:
or else an humaine and worldly glorifying of himselfe, after the
fashion of men, which he called Vayne. According vnto
this Sence he spake, and applied his meaning vnto the mea-
ning of the Jewes themselves, as hath beene confessed. Which
fashion of Christs applying his speech vnto the understand-
ing of the hearer, is so far from iustifying of their Murtherall
Equivocation, that it doth cleerely confute it, because in it
there

there is reſerued ſuch a meaning, as neither man, nor Angell doth vnderſtand, by any circumstance of ſpeech, as when the Romiſh Prieſt answered that he was *No Prieſt*, meaning of *Apollo* or *Baall*, and ſuch like. Was it not then a ſtrange aduenture of *M. Parſons*, from a ſpeech ſpoken and applied to the hearers meaning, to ſeek to infer a *Mentall Reſervation*, wherein there is inſoulded a meaning, which doth nor, nor cannot accord at all ynto the vnderſtanding of the Hearer?

The ſixt place, *Verſ. 55.*

M. PARSONS his Appendix.

Reſponſa. 685.

Verſ. 55.

Th. 1. 16.

Furthermore in the very next verſe, ſalking of almighty God, he ſaid to the Iewes, *Non cognouiſtis eum, you doe not know him: which ſeemet to ſerue in it ſelfe, for that the Iewes did profeſſe to know him, and ſerue him, above all the people in the world. And in the olde Teſtament it is often ſaid of them, that they, of all other people, did beſt know God: and therefore ſome other reſerued meaning muſt Chriſt our Saviour neede haue had, then theſe earthly wordes doe inſinuate. Which Reſervation Saine Chryſoſt. S. Aug. S. Bede. and Throphilact upon this place doe thinke to haue bene this in Chriſt his ſecret meaning, that they did not know God, as they ought to know him, by ſeruing him as he would and ought to be ſerued, according to the ſpeech of Saine Paul to Titus. *Confitentur ſe noſce Deum, factis autem negant. They confeſſe to know God in words, but doe denie him in deedes. So as here alſo an Equinoſation of ſpeech muſt be ſerued by our Saviour.**

The Reſeruation

14 There is a double ſence of *Not knowing of God*, taught openly in Scripture, the one is in reſpect of the intellectuall part of man, when Gods will is not rightly beleeued, ſo the Gentiles are often ſaid *Not to haue knowne God*, and to haue had *No knowledge of his waies*; and contrariwiſe of the Iewes the

* Pſal.

the Scripture saith, * *In Iuris is God well knowne.* The second sence, of *Not knowing God*, is in respect of the practi-
call and actuall duetie, when he that beleueth and profes-
seth the true and sincere worship of God, doth notwithstanding wilfully and rebelliously transgresse his will, in which
consideration *Saint Iohn* saith, *He that saith he knoweth God, 1. Epist. 2.*
and yet keepeth not his Commaundement is a lyar. We see then
that this phraze of *Not knowing God*, hath a double sence, but
yet through *Verball Equiuocation*, and both of them agree
with truth: for some of these with whom *Christ* spake, did
not truely and intellectuely know God, because they knew
him not *Sub ratione Patris eterni*, as *Card. * Caietane* saith. * *In hunc locum*
And concerning the practi-
call acknowledgement there,
*Card. * Tolet* is direct, saying that *Christ* speaketh here of a * *In eund.*
knowledge which doth not onely signifie the act of understanding,
but which also comprehendeth the act of the will and affection,
in imitation of God; in which regard *1. Reg. 2.* the sonnes of
Heli the Priest are called the children of *Beliall*, who know not
God: And our Sauour in the same verse of *S. Iohn*, saying by
an *Antithesis* and opposition. *But I know him, and keepe his*
Commaundement, doth expound himselfe, and reuealeth his
meaning, signifying that *They knew not God, because they*
kept not his Commaundement, as their *Card. * Tolet* noteth; and * *Ibid.*
their Bishop * *Iansenius* saith that this is *Apparant*: which is * *Concord Ibid.*
vtterly contrary vnto *M. Parsons* his *Mentall Equiuocati-*
on. As for example, *I haue no money* (meaning secretly,) to
lend it vnto you: this Reseruati-
on, to lend it, is locked vp
close, lest it should be reuealed, and cannot naturally be im-
plied in those outward words, *I haue no money*: and hath
beene called by the *Ies. Acaarius* a flat * *lye*. Therefore there * *See above.*
is as little affinitie betweene *Christ's* sentences, and *M.*
Parsons his Reseruati-
on, as betweene light and darknesse:
truth and a lye.

The seuenth place, verse 56.

M. PARSONS Appendix.

Again, in the ensuing verse, which is the 56. *Christ* said to *Rock pag. 685.*
686.

S f

the

the Jewes: Your Father Abraham did reioyce to see my day, and saw it, and tooke ioy thereby. Which words in the common sence doe seeme to import; that Abraham had lined with Christ, and had seene the day of his birth, and life, and taken great ioy thereby: and so did the Jewes understand his meaning to be, not onely the common people, but the Scribes and Pharisees also, when they said vnto him, Thou hast not yet fifty yeares of age, and hast thou seene Abraham? Wherein notwithstanding they were greatly deceiued, for that Christ had another reserved meaning in his minde, which the holy Fathers doe labour greatly to expound vnto vs, what it was, and in what true sence our Saviour said that Abraham had seene his day: whose different opinions, reasons, and coniectures I will not stand to relate here; It is sufficient for me to haue shewed, that this was an Equiuocall speech of our Saviour, whereby the hearers being deceiued, the truth of the speech may onely be defended by a reservation in the minde of the speaker.

The Review.

15 In this there is another Verball Equiuocation, in the word *See*, for some saw the day of Christs being in the world only by Reuelation, as *Abraham*, and the Patriarks; as *Esay*, and the Prophets; as *Iob*, and all the beleeuers before Christ: And some saw the day of his being in the flesh sensibly, as *Peter*, and the other Apostles; as *Mary* our Lords Mother, holy *Ioseph*, *Simeon*, and other holy men, and women, yea and as *Caiphas*, and other vnbeleeuing Jewes. That *Abraham* is meant to haue *Seene* the day of Christs birth spiritually, thorow Reuelation, their Card. *Tolet* will not deny: but the Jewes that scorned him, mistooke this sence, and conceited only a sensuall Seeing with bodily eies.

Com in cum locum.

16 Who now seeth not *M. Parsons* his fraud, who calleth that a reserved sence, which was (that I may so say) a sence conserued in the outward words themselves, and sufficiently manifest, if the scornefull Jewes, who were now blinded with malice, had not peruerted them into a sensuall Construction.

For

For what phrase in the old Testament is more familiar and notorious, then to call that *Seeing*, which is perceiued onely spiriually? for the which cause the Prophets were called * *Seers*. And shall the misconceit of incredulous hearers * 1. Reg. 9. make the sence of *Christ* to be mentally referred? As for *M. Parsons* his maner of *Reseruation*, when a man shall say, *I keepe no Priest in mine house*, meaning; with any intent to bake him in a *Pie*, or &c. It is so farre of from a *Verball Equiuocation*, which may be implied by the outward words, as that no man without Reuelation from God can comprehend it. But I hasten.

The last place, *Verse 58.*

M. PARSONS *Appendix.*

And finally in the next verse after this againe *Christ* useth *Reckon* p. 686. a greater *Equiuocation* than any before, saying unto them, 687. *Amen, Amen, antequam Abraham fieret, ego sum. Amen, Amen, I say unto you, that before Abraham was made; I am;* which being an earnest speech; and as it were an oath, as elsewhere we haue noted, the *Iewes* vnderstood it as it lyeth, that *Christ* was borne in the flesh before *Abraham*; and so is seemeth that he should haue meant according to his former speech, when he said that *Abraham* desired to see his day, and saw it, and reioyced thereat: Which was vnderstood of his incarnation or day in flesh, which *Abraham* in faith and spirit did see, and reioyce. But yet here when he saith that he is before *Abraham* was made, he must needs meane of his *Diuinitie*; and in that he was *God*: which *S. Aug.* vpon this place, doth excellently note to be by the difference of the two words, *Abraham fieret*, & *Ego sum*, the one belonging to the creature, saith he, the other to the Creator. So as more then our *Equiuocation* is used by our *Sauour* in this one sentence.

The Review.

17 But doth any Author say, that in the word, *Sum*, as it is here vsed (that is) *I am*, there is any *Equiuocation*? for

S f 2

seeing

This saith
their Ies. Mal-
donate vpon
this place.

seeing that *Christ* (as *Saint Aug.* and *Almost all other Authors have noted*) did distinguish the *Creature*, (man) by *fi-
ret*, was made, from the *Creator*, which was his *God-head*,
by the word, *Sum, I am*, he did not inferre, but remoue the
ambiguities of that phrase: Nay I adde further; the word,
Sum, in this speech of *Christ* seemed euen vnto these incre-
dulous Iewes to be so farre from doubtfulnesse, and so plain-
ly to signifie his *Deity*, that they accounting it to be blasphemous,
tooke vp *Stones* to cast at him; which their owne

▪ Vpon the
same place.

▪ *Doctors* haue also obserued, as *Card. Tolet*: *Because that
Exod. 3.* (saith he) *God said, Sum qui sum, that is, I am,*
*that I am, the Iewes knew that Christ did not onely preferre
himselfe before Abraham in respect of time, but also publish
himselfe to be God.* Which is likewise the obseruation of

▪ *Ibid.*

▪ *Caictane*, saying that because *Christ* did hereby manifest
his *Diuinitie*, therefore it is added that *They tooke vp stones
to throw at him.* This sence being so euident vnto the hear-
ers, sheweth that there was not so much as a *Verball Equi-
uocation*; much lesse *M. Parsons* his *Mentall Reseruati-
on*, which the hearer doth not onely not know, but cannot pos-
sibly guesse what it is: As for example, if one should say,
I am no Priest, reseruing in his minde, *As fit to keepe Swine.*
We see by this time the manifold ridiculous absurdities,
which *M. Parsons* hath inforced in this fond *Appendix*,
whereof notwithstanding he doth not a little boast, as we
shall see.

M. PARSONS his Appendix.

Reckn. p. 687. And if we lay all these Equiuocall speeches together which
are 8. or 9. at least contained within a peece of one only Chapter
of our Saviours talke with the Iewes, Scribes, and Pharisees, we
shall be able to make some guesse, how many might be found thro-
wout the whole new Testament and Bible, if we would examine
the same particularly, as we haue done this: and thereby see how
true *M. Mortons* bold assertion was in his booke of *Full Satisfaction*.
*That no one iote in all Scripture, no one example in all Ca-
tholike*

Per. 49.

tholike Antiquity could be found for the same. *His tearmes also of heathenish, hellish, heinous, and impious Equiuocation, with other infamations of his brother- Minister King, may appeare what substantiall ground they haue.*

The Reuiew, shewing the absurdities of M PAR-
SONS his Collection.

18 If all the speeches, which *M. Parsons* inforceth for Instances to patterne and to iustifie his fashion of *Equiuocating*, may be called *Mentall Reservations*, then may we grant that not onely eight, but euen all the sentences, yea and almost euery word of this, & all other Chapters may be proued to be Mentally *Equiuocal*. And for demonstration sake (because I wil not profane the sacred Scripture with such idle crotchetting) I thinke good to descant a little but vpon any one sentence, which *M. Parsons* can vtter, and try, if that almost euery word may not imply a kinde of Reservation. As for example, suppose *M. Parsons* should haue deliuered this speech saying, *I will as long as I liue go vnto the Church to pray vnto God.* Which in the vnderstanding of any man of sense is sensible enough, yet the first particule is *I* meaning a man, and no woman: the second word *will*, meaning, with a resolued and not a dissembling will: 3. *As long*, meaning the length of time, and not the length of body: 4. *As I liue*, meaning, a life animall in this flesh, and not Angelicall out of the body: 5. *Go*, meaning, by walking, and not by dancing: 6. *Vnto the Church*, meaning of Catholikes, and not of Heretikes: 7. *To pray*, meaning, mediately by Saints and not immediately by my selfe, 8. *vnto God*, meaning, the God of Christians, & not any God of the Pagans. What can be more plainly spoken then the sentence aforesaid, and yet how many meanings suppressed, which may not therefore be called *Mentall Reservations*, otherwise *M. Parsons* might as well infer that he neuer promised any lawfull thing vnto any man neuer tooke an oath by any lawfull authority of man, without some *Mentall reservation*, the vse whereof he himselfe

hath iudged in all such cases to be detestable. I shall haue further occasion to vnfold the grosselesse of his Inference more at large by other examples, after that I haue satisfied some other obiections.

SECT. IIII.

An Answer vnto some other places of Scripture, wherein M. PARSONS hath insisted in his booke of *Mitigation*, for the defence of his *Mentall Equiuocation*.

I doubt how my Reader might censure me, if after the Confutation of M. Parsons his former Instances out of Scripture, I should inquire into his other booke of *Mitigation*, to seeke al other examples, to prosecute them, because this would breed tediousnesse: I therefore wil but choose out some of his choisest places, and so hasten to a Conclusion of this Treatise.

The first text, which M. PARSONS vrgeth in his booke of *Mitigation*, is taken out of Iohn 1. verse 21.

M. PARSONS his Mitigation.

Mitigat. c. 19. §. 2. p. 359.

We shall begin with an example so cleere, as it shall be like to that of ours in all points, if we change only the names of persons, and conditions of men that spake and heard. As that example of S. Iohn Baptist, who being examined and demanded by them, that were sent vnto him from the Iewes, whether he were a Prophet, or no? he demied it: *Propheta es tu? & spondit non: Are you a Prophet, and he answered No, and yet he meant not absolutely to deny himselfe to be a Prophet, for that it had bene false both in respect of that his father Zacharias had prophesied of him in his Natiuitie, calling him the Prophet of the highest, Luke 1. as also in respect of Christs testimony, who Math. 11. called*

called him more than a Prophet, &c. Heere then you see a Proposition uttered by the holy Ghost, that of it selfe is ambiguous, and of a doubtfull sense, and according to the ordinary sound and sense of the words uttered, seemeth false, no lesse then our Proposition, I am no Priest. For as this may be refused by them that know me to be a Priest, and as Th. Morton still vrgeth (though fondly) is contrary to my knowledge and conscience, that know my selfe to be a Priest, &c.

The Review.

20 ^a Maldonate the Iesuite (and, as it seemeth *M. Parsons* out of him) collecteth out of *Fathers* three diuerse meanings of the Iewes in their question: the first was, whether he were that singular Prophet, which they fancied should come together with Christ, and he answered, *I am not*, which was true according to that their sense. Secondly, some thought that the Iewes meant by their demand to know, whether he were any one of the ancient Prophets, who were long before Christ? And he answered, satisfying them truely according to that their sense, saying, *I am not*: Thirdly, some taught that the Iewes by their Interrogatory thought to know, whether he were any Prophet at all by his proper Office? Now *Iohn* albeit he was a Prophet by Grace and power, because he was sent by God, and did exhort, reprove, and conuert sinners, yet was he not a Prophet by ordinary Office: and applying his Answer to this sense, said, *I am not*, and that truely, because *Iohn* did not Prophesie: and thus the answer agreed to that their sense. Obserue, (good Reader against *M. Parsons* his Observation) that the Answer of *S. Iohn*, who is the speaker, doth accord (by the iudgement of all Authors) vnto the supposed seuerall vnderstandings of the Iewes, and Questionists, who were the hearers: Contrariwise the Romish Priest being demanded by a Magistrate, whether he be a Priest; returneth this Answer, [*I am not a Priest*], onely with this referred sense, *With purpose to tell it vnto you*; which doth flatly thwart the intencion of the Magistrate, and Questionist

^a Maldon. 1es.
upon the place
discouerseth these
points to the ful.

^b *Milt.* p. 361.

nist *M. Parsons* is like to make a lucklesse end, who is so unfortunate in this beginning.

The second place objected out of *Matth. 9.20.*

M. PARSONS his Mitigation.

Mitig. p. 365.

Our Saviour Christ comming to raise the Arch-Synagogue his daughter, found the people in tumult, weeping and lamenting for her death, whom he repressed, saying, *Recedite, non est enim mortua puella, sed dormit*; Depart, for that the maid is not dead, but sleepeth; and yet is it certaine that naturally she was dead, by separation of her soule from her body. So as if this Proposition be taken strictly as it lyeth, without any Mentall Resurrection by our Saviour, it cannot be true neither in it selfe, nor in the sense of the hearers, no more than in our proposition, I am no priest. The mentall Resurrection in our Saviour, according to *S. Augustines* explication, and other expositions, was that albeit she was dead in their sight, and unto humane power: yet unto him, and unto his divine power and will to raise her againe, she was not dead, but onely a sleepe.

The Review.

21 Christ wrought many miracles among them, wherein he did demonstrate his Diuine power, as, among others, in curing the woman which had a *Bloody issue*, whom he healed euen in the way as he came to the house of this Arch-synagogue. In respect of which his diuine power, euen they that are dead are said to be but *a sleepe*, which is a most frequent and ordinary phrase of speech in Scripture. To this purpose their Card. *Tolet* commenting vpon this Scripture, alladgeth those places out of the old Testament, where they who dyed are said to haue *Slept with their Fathers*: And out of the new, *1. Cor. 11.* *Many fell a sleepe, from the which Metaphor and truth (saith he) the Apostle doth gather an argument of consolation vnto all Christians, to teach them*

Tolet. in hunc locum.

not

not to mourne as men without hope, ignorant of the resurrection
 1. Thess. 4. In regard of which his Omnipotent power,
 whereby this woman was now speedily to be raised, *He doth*
comfort those who now wept, as he spake of Lazarus Iohn 11.
(saying, Lazarus sleepeeth, and I must goe and awake him: But
here they, who did deride Christ as though he had utterly denied
that the maid was dead (because they were destitute of his light
of faith,) did measure Christs power by their owne. So he. Now
 then the Metaphor of calling Death a *Sleepe*, being so fa-
 miliar vnto all the Religious of those daies, the diuine power
 of Christ being by many miracles made so famous and ma-
 nifest among them: we may iudge (seeing that the raising of
 a dead woman to life was no more difficultie then the awa-
 king her out of a sleepe, which he intended presently to do)
 that both his denying her to be *Dead*, and his affirming that
 she was but a *Sleepe* were but *Verbal amphibologies*, which all
 they might haue vnderstood, who were not *Scornefull* and
 incredulous contemners of his sayings. But the Priests Equi-
 uocation, as this; *I am no Priest*, meaning, *as ordained to*
kill a Calfe, or such like, is so farre beyond the horizon and
 sight of any mans capacitie, that he may sooner claspe hold
 of the man in the moone, then by any intimation of
 words, or circumstance of speech reach vnto such a refer-
 ued conceit.

The third, fourth, and fifth, places out
 of Iohn 6.

M. PARSONS his Mitigation.

In the Gospell by S. Iohn, speaking of the eating of his flesh, *Mittig. p. 366.*
 If any shall eate of this bread, he shall liue for euer; and yet *367.*
 S. Paul saith to the contrary, 1. Cor. 11. He that eateth and
 drinketh vnwoorthily, doth eate or drinke his owne iudge-
 ment, or condemnation. By which words of S. Paul it is made
 manifest, that the former words of Christ cannot absolutely be
 true, without some Mental Reseruation or restriction in his vn-
 derstanding,

^o Pag. 367.

derstanding, for that not all that eat and drinke, but they onely that doe it worthily, haue life euermlasting. Secondly, there is discovered what this reservation was, to wit, Digne, worthily. And ^o Iob. 16. If you aske my Father any thing in my name, he will giue it you, reseruing, if we aske not male, as S. Iames expoundeth it, Iam. 4. So Mar. 16. He that beleueneth and is baptized shall be saued, Reseruing; if he beleene according to Gods commandment, as Christ expoundeth it, Matth. 28. &c.

The Reniew.

22 If we had no other scantling of *M. Parsons* his iudgement, then this, we may guesse what was his indiligence in the Study of Diuinity, seeing he could be ignorant of that, which is a most generall Canon and Rule alwaies to be obserued in Scripture, and so acknowledged by their Iesuit

⁴ Salmeron Def. ^o Salmeron, to wit: When as any Promises are propounded, they are so to be understood, that not so much the effect, as the vertue and nature of the thing, whereunto the Promise is annexed, be signified thereby: and so are we to interpret that of S. Mark, He that beleueneth, and is baptized, shall be saued & (viz. so far as belongeth vnto the nature and faith of Baptisme.) And againe that of Iob. 6. He that eateth my flesh hath life euermlasting, namely, so much as the nature of faith and the Sacrament doth teach, which hath a vertue of helping forward vnto eternall life, if there be not some thing to hinder the effect, or some condition awanting, which albei it be not in that place, yet is it expressed else-where, as Ioel 2. where it is said, whosoever shall call vpon the name of the Lord, shall be saued, wherein there is understood, that the praier be made with a liuely faith, as it is elſewhere explained. And Matth. 7. it is said, euery one, that asketh, receiuet, understanding this condition, if he aske those things, which are right and profitable as S. Iames sheweth, Ia. 4. saying, you aske and receiue not, because you aske amisse, to consume them vpon your Concupiscences. Thus far their Iesuit *Salmeron*. Was there euer any man so simple, as not to know that in all Arts which are prescribed of God this Digne, that is, the necessary

4 Salmeron Def.
Tom. 1. Proleg.
15. reg. 31. p. 4.

294

Mar. vii.

cessary maner of doing it according to Gods ordinance is vnderstood, although it be not literally exprest? For when the Master of the family giueth his seruants bread and meate, for their food, & saith, *Eate this faire will cherish your hearts*, will any say that this is not a speech direct enough, but had a reserued sence as namely this, *If they did eat it moderately, and not in greater bits, then which they could digest, or If they mixed it not with poison, which bread then might proue their bane*. If all such Clauses, which might be supposed must be called Reservations, then is there no speech, but it may containe a thousand Reservations.

23 The truth is, that whensoever there is any good thing commanded, the speech is plaine, direct, and perfect enough although the word, *Worthily*, be not exprest; because the necessary condition of every good Act doth ordinarily conueigh vnto euery hearer this vnderstanding, that it must be done *digne worthily*, or *duely*; for that *bona non sunt bona, nisi bene agantur*, that is, *There is no good action, which is not well or worthily done*: and therefore the word, *worthily*, or *duely*, being so naturally, commonly, and necessarily implied in such speeches, it evidently euinceth, that this maketh nothing for *M. Parsons* his maner of *Reservation*, which is so intricate a fox-hole, as which neither man, nor diuell, who goeth inuisibly, can creepe into. For this speech, [*To kisse the Popes foote, is a ceremony besitting the honour of his person*,] euery Romanist will thinke to be an Assertion true and plaine enough, without any word, *Worthily*; albeit to kisse the Popes foote curiously, as the dogge did, that bit him by the toe, were a dishonour vnto him. But *M. Parsons* his *Mentall Reservation* is cleane contrary, and so intricately hankled, that neither man, nor diuell can finde the right end of the threed, or guesse what can be meant thereby; as when a Priest being denâded, whether he be a Priest, should answer, *No*, reseruing in his minde, *such an one as is chaste, or such an one as can hope to be Pope*, & any like clause of speech.

24 In like maner might I descant vpon his * instance of * *Ming. p. 367.*
Asking and receiuing because in *Matth. 7. Aske and you shall*

have, the condition whereof is expounded by *S. Iames*, viz. so that we aske not *Amisse*. Which condition (and the same may be answered concerning others) is sonecessarily vnderstood by every hearer, that though it be not expressed in outward words, yet is it discernable in the common notion and sence of the hearer at the first sound of every such sentence. As when the Father shall say vnto all his children, *Aske me blessing, and I will blesse you*; and all shall fall downe vpon their knees, and aske his blessing, yet so, that one among the rest, whilst he is crauing his blessing, should turne his face another way, and play with a dogge; Another should put out his tongue, in scorne and contempt of his father; a third should aske only to be blessed with some groats in his purse; would that Father vse the forme of blessing towards these fondlings, and not first correct them for their rude and vntoward behauiours? or would *M. Parsons* excuse them, because the Father expressed not the maner of *Asking*, to wit, that they ought to haue done it dutifully, and decently, as it becommeth children? would he call these kinde of conditions *Reservations*, because they were not literally deliuered in words, which are as it were, ingrafted in the common sence of every man, and so generally implied by the ordinary and accustomable acceptance of speech, according to the vnderstanding of all hearers, except they be as ignorant as Infantes, or Idiots? whereas the *Reservation* we dispute against, is (as *M. Parsons* saith) *what a man list to frame to himselfe*; and consequently may surmount not onely the ordinary capacitie of mortall men, but euen the subtility of the Angels in heauen: as to say, *I am no Priest*, meaning, *Whose name is Tom Tyler, or Watt Miller, or so* forth *in infinitum*

The last Instance out of *Esay* 38.

M. PARSONS his Mitigation.

Mitig. p. 368.

I should utterly weary my Reader, if I would follow all, or the greatest

greatest part of that which may be said in this behalfe, for that alwaies commonly all Prophecies that are minatorie, and doe threaten punishment, haue still some secret reservation, if they repent not: as that of Iſay to Ezechias: *Hæc dicit Dominus, dispoſe domui tuæ quia morieris tu, & non viues: This ſaith our Lord, diſpoſe of thy houſhold, for thou ſhalt dye, and ſhalt not liue, and yet he liued fifteene yeares after. If therefore the Prophet had bene demanded, Shall not Ezechias liue any longer? and he had answered, No, vpon what had fallen the negative No? if onely vpon wordes vitered, it had bene falſe, for he liued longer, but if vpon that together with the Reſervation in the meaning of the holy Ghoſt it was true. And the like may be ſaid of the prophecie of Ionas, Adhuc quadraginta dies, & Niniue ſubuerſetur; There remaine but fortie daies, before Niniue ſhall be deſtroyed, and ſo infinite other places: Wherefore in this Tho. Morton was greatly ouer ſeene, in making of a confident Challenge, as before you haue ſeene,*

The Reuiew.

25 I rather thinke the Reader hath bene already wearied with multiplicities of ſuch idle and fond Inſtances, which proue nothing leſſe then the point in queſtion, as hath hitherto appeared; and may now, by diſcuſſing this laſt place, be further diſcouered. It is an ordinary Rule in Diuinitie, acknowledged by their Ieſuit * *Ribera*, that *The* * Ribera Ieſ. in
threatnings, which God uſeth, doe containe in them a ſecret con-
dition, Except they repent. Whereof Saint Chryſoſt. ſpeaketh
Rom. 27. *ſonam, cap. 3.* thus: *If (ſaith he) men were not changed, ſuch propheſies would take place; but becauſe men are changed, therefore the prophecie, although it be not fulfilled, yet doth it not faile, for that God doth preſerue his common-law, which he hath made, to wit, If a Nation ſhall repent of her ſinne, I will alſo repent of the euill, which I thought to bring vpon it. Still we ſee that the error, which hath blind-folded M. Parsons, is, that he doth not diſtinguiſh the Senſum conſignatum, à ſenſu reſeruato, that A neceſſarie is; ſence implied in the very ſpeech it ſelfe; by reaſon of the diſtinction.*

common and ordinary vse thereof, from the *reserved sense*, which is such as neither the common acception of words doe conueigh, nor the most intelligent (God onely excepted) can possibly conceiue, or apprehend.

*¶ H. m. Stephen
Apol. pro He-
redoto, li. 1. s. 3.*

26 This point may be thus explained. *' An Embassa-
dour being sent vnto the Pope from a Prince in Germany, after
that he had taken his leaue, & was dismissed of the Pope in these
words, [Dic dilecto filio nostro salutem] that is, [Commend me
vnto my beloued Sonne your Master] he fourth with (doubting
least the Pope had called his Master a bastard) answered all in a
sume, My Master (quoth he) is no Priest's Sonne. The word,
Sonne, in the Popes speech signified a spiritual, and not a na-
turall son-ship and filiation, as both the person of the spea-
ker, and the ordinary vse of that salutation did import, and
therefore was a sense implied in the speech, and not reserved
onely in the minde, as in their other Priestly Equiuocating
is vsually practized, as to say, I am no Priest, (reseruing in
minde) as willing to indanger my selfe, by confessing that I am a
Priest.*

27 This likewise must be obserued, that we are not to
call a speech ambiguous, or els reserved, because it is not vn-
derstood by the giddy & vndiscreet hearer, as by the former
example is manifest, and may be made more conspicuous
and euident by this that followeth of a Mother, who chid
& rated her daughter for her rude and rurell cariage towards
her affienced louer, especially for not thanking him, after
that he had drunke vnto her; and therefore her mother, for
her better preparation and direction how to behaue herselfe
more orderly at their next meeting, spake thus vnto her
daughter; *Caust thou not say vnto him, (quoth she) the next
time he drinketh to thee, [I thanke you] thou great foole:* the
daughter, silly body, not discerning the true distinction of
the points of that speech, did vpon the next occasion of his
drinking vnto her, answer, *I pledge you, thou great foole.*
Such like absurd & foolish examples I am, beyond my incli-
natio, forced to produce, that thereby I might better display
the folly and absurdity of *M. Parsons* his defence of *Aden-
tall*

all Reservation, which he oftentimes foundeth vpon the rotten post of the Jewes insatuation; and vpon their misconstruction of the sayings of *Christ*.

28 Besides these foresaid obiections, *M. Parsons* in ^{his} *Mitig. cap. 9. chap.* calleth and challengeth me to make a better Answer ^{9. pag. 387.} concerning an other saying of *Christ*, wherein he doth triumph intolerably.

6. V.

An Answer to an old obiection, which hath beene taken out of that saying of *Christ* to his Disciples; *I will not goe to the feast, my time is not yet come, Iohn*

7. vers. 8.

29 **M**Vch adoe haue we had about this text, as well concerning the Reading, as touching the Sence thereof. We must begin with the first.

The summe of *M. PARSONS* obiection, concerning the Reading.

But what doth he accuse vs of, in effect? forsooth that we *Mitig. p. 389.* haue left the Greeke text, which hath *nondum*, not yet, and doe follow your vulgar Latine, which hath onely *et*, that is, non not, the difference of which word maketh a maine difference in the matter, if you marke it well, for if the true text be *nondum*, I will not yet goe vp, then is there no doubt or difficultie at all of the sence, for that *Christ* said plainly that he would not goe vp then, and so his going vp afterward had beene no contradiction any way to his former speech of not going vp, as here our *Maldonate* cited by *Morton* doth confesse: but on the other side, if the matter were so plaine, by reading *nondum* in the Greeke why doe the Fathers labour so much to finde out the secret meaning and reserved sence of our *Sauour* in this sentence, and seeming contradiction of his? * *Mitig. pag. 389 390.* For if that word had

had bene in all Greeke bookes, and so held for the true text, there had bene no question, or Controuersie, as Expositors confesse: yet to grant with Maldonate, alleadged by Th. Morton, that very many Greeke Copies had so in former times, and haue it at this day, neither doth our vulgar deny or dissemble it; for albeit it haue non, and not nondum, yet doth it expressly signifie in the margent, that diuerse Manuscripts haue nondum, and so doth set it downe for *Varia lectio*, yea the Rhemes English Testament it selfe doth expresse that translation also in the margent, I will not goe vp yet.

The review.

30 I can say no lesse, nor neede I say much more then that which is confessed by Romish Doctors vpon this place: First, their Iesuit Maldonate, Almost ennumerable Greeke bookes (saith he) reade *non* (not yet) *uolunt*, but especially the Vaticane Bible, the most ancient and famous of all in the world, and Nomius, Chrysostome, Euthemius very grane Authors doe both reade it so, and also expound it, and so am I perswaded that it is read of Theophylact. And *non* which is the reading of Chrysostome (saith their Card. Tolet) is most legitimate. And there is that witnesseth (saith Iansenius) that some ancient Latine Copies hath is *Nondum*, that is, not yet. Their Iesuit Sa. making no further question saith, that The Greeke hath it, I ascend not yet, and the Siriac, I ascend not now. And lastly Card. Caietane correcting the Latine by the Greeke, saith it hath not, instead of not yet. We haue now scene his egregious Caull.

M. PARSONS his Mitigation.

Mitig. p. 391. And doe we contradict this? your very next immedicate words doe cleare vs from this your calumination, for it followeth in your speech: your Latine text (say you) doth sufficiently betoken the same sence of the Greeke (not yet) and so doe two of the principall Doctors of your Church, Tolet and

and Iansenius paraphrase. And is it so? how then are we so blinded with the lense of our Thais, as rather to snatch at any meaning, then take that which is meant? How say you that our Helena, the Latine Translation, is imbraced by vs before the Greeke, if our Latine doe not onely betoken the same sence of the Creeke, as here you confesse, but setteth it downe so as Varia lectio in the margin, as before hath bene shewed; yea and that two of our principall Dottors doe follow the same in their paraphrases? Is not this to accuse and defend, affirme and deny, and so speake contraries with one and the same breath?

The Reuiew.

31 No, there is no contrariety in my Assertions; but this obiection of Contradiſtion is so vaine, that it may be blowne away with one breath: for in the Greeke text there is a double *Nondum*, the first is, *I will [not yet] goe vpp, viz.* to the feast; the second is the reason hereof, *because mine hower is [not yet] fulfilled.* The first [*Not yet*] which doth demonstratiuely expound the meaning of Christ, is wanting in the Latine; and the second [*Not yet*] which doth also proue, but lesse manifestly the same meaning, remaineth in the Latine text; and therefore may it be said to haue in these diuerse respects both fully, and not fully betokened the same sence. Hitherto of words.

The Summe of M. PARSONS his Obiection, concerning the Sence.

M. PARSONS his Mitigation.

If the matter were so plaine by the reading of *nondum* in the Greeke, why doe the ancient Fathers labour so much to find out the secret meaning, and reserved sence of our Saniour in this sentence, and seeming contradiction of his? For S. August. and S. Bede after much search, doe thinke his meaning to haue bene, that he would not ascend to that feast with an humane

ſpirit, to procure any wordly honour, &c. Strabus, and other Expositors doe interpret that he would not goe up to exhibit his Paſſion, Eucherius, that he would not aſcend on the firſt day of the feaſt. * Whereſſe ſeeing theſe and other Fathers doe labour ſo much to finde out the meaning of Chriſt in this ſentence, it is not like that the matter was ſo cleare as T. M. would make it, by the claufe Nondum. For if that word had bene in all Greeke bookes, and ſo held for true text, there had bene no queſtion or Controuerſie, as our Expositors confeſſe.

The Review.

32 How many, how ancient, and how famous Copies, in ſtead of, *I will not goe up to the feaſt*, haue, *I will not yet goe up to the feaſt*, (whereby the whole doubt is thoroughly diſſolued) yea and how true that reading is we haue received from the Confeſſions of their owne Doctours. Why ſome Fathers (and why not then much more Porphyrius, whom M. Parſons obiecteth) were ignorant of ſuch Coppies, what better reaſon neede be given than that it ſo chaunced that they had them not?

33 But we are in the ſecond place to inquire, (ſuppoſing the Greeke word *ἔτι*, (which in Latine is *Nondum*, and in Engliſh *not yet*, were not in the ſentence) whether the ſame ſence may be eaſily gathered out of the Text, or not: For if the words of the Text it ſelfe doe ſufficiently betoken the meaning of Chriſt to haue bene, that he thought not to goe vp yet, v^z. at that time, then is there no ſeeming contradiction in that ſentence, and conſequently no colour or ſhadow of any *Mentall Reſervation*. To this purpoſe I

i. Fol. ſatiff.
ſatiff. part. 3.
cap. 11. pag.
79. 80.

produced the iudgement of Tolet, their late Cardinall, and ſometime leſuin ſaying that [*I will not goe up*] doth ſignifie, *I will not goe up yet*; which he proueth from the words that follow immediately in the Text, [*for my time is not yet fulfilled*:] That is, (ſaith Tolet) *The time when I ought to goe up*. And accordingly their Biſhop * Ianſenius *The word Not, which is in the Latine, ſignifieth plainly Not yet, which ſence* (ſaith

* Fol. ſatiff.
ſatiff. ibid.

(saith he) is sufficiently shew'n by the words following, viz. [be-
cause my time] namely wherein I must goe to the feast, [is not
yet fulfilled,] that is, not yet come: And this he calleth the
genuous and naturall sence of the place. Which being graun-
ted, the sence of Christ, euen according to M. Parsons his
iudgement, is sufficiently exprest and not reserved, and
consequently here is no footing for his *Reservation*. In the
third place we are to satisfie for the different opinion of some
Fathers.

M. PARSONS his Obiection.

To shew one point of manhood in this his flight, he taketh up- Mitig. p. 339.
on him to answer one of these six Arguments alledg'd against
him, which is the fourth, concerning the ancient Fathers that
laboured to seeke out Christs reserved meaning. You shall see
him insinuate two points, first is that the ancient Fathers did
suppose that whatsoever meaning was in these words, They (the
said kinsmen of our Saviour) did understand them, as well
then, to wit, before the Gospell was written, and before the ho-
ly Ghost was given, as the said Christian Fathers did after-
wards by the learning and light which they had by the spirit and
tradition of the Church: which proposition if he were put to
prope in the presence of learned men, I doubt not but that he
would quickly be in a poore and pitifull plight.

The Review.

34 That which I said was onely concerning the sence
of this place of Scripture, whereof I affirmed that the Fa-
thers thought their expositions, (whatsoever it was which
they iudged to be true) to be as well knowne vnto these dis-
ciples of Christ, as to themselves; which M. Parsons ma-
keth to be a generall assertion, concerning any other sence
of Scripture whatsoever. If it may be lawfull for him to deale
thus inoriously, viz. by perverting a particular Case into a
generall, and so cast me into a pit of his owne making, none

(I confesse) neede to doubt but my *plight* must be *pittifull*: but if my Reader shall consider that he hath cut of the Reason which I then produced, to proue that the Brethren there mentioned did know that it was the meaning of *Christ*, not to deny absolutely but that he intended to goe vp to the feast, viz. *Because otherwise they should haue bene scandalized and offended, as to thinke that he had contemned the feast, which, by Gods ordinance were yet alive, and in force,* (as their ¹ *Iansenius* affirmed, whereunto their ¹ *Tolus* doth expressely accord) then may he easily discern that *M. Parsons* was herein more spitefull then I was *pittifull*; But we proccede vnto the chiefe obseruation.

² In locum consu-
1 eruerunt.

M. PARSONS his Mitigation.

Mitig. pag. 393.
394.

The second thing which by this answer he would haue vnderstand, is, that if those brethren, or kinsmen of *Christ*, did any way conceiue our Saviours meaning, then was there no reservation at all, for that as he saith, our ioyned reservation is alwaies supposed to be a clause concealed, and not vnderstood. But this is a greater foolery then the first, for that there may be a reservation in the speakers minde, though vnderstood to some of the hearers. As for example, in our proposition being demanded, whether I be a Priest, and say, no, reseruing to my selfe, as often before hath bene declared, that I am no such, or such Priest, as I ought to utter the same to you, though some of the Examiners should guesse at my reservation, or know the same certainly, for that otherwise they know I am a Priest, this doth not make that this proposition is selfe, and in my meaning is not a reserved, or Equiuocall proposition, for that they vnderstand it.

The Review.

35 This is the last and chiefeft point of all this Controuerfie; which if he haue wisely and truly satisfied, then shall I ingeniously confesse, that my whole exception against *M.*

Parsons

Parsons his *Mentall Equiuocation* is, indeede, no better then meere foolery. But the truth is, that my exception against his Art of Equiuocating is not because the *Mentall Reservation*, which he teacheth, is not vnderstood of some hearers, but because it is so couched, that it cannot be possibly vnderstood of any hearer: for *The Clause of Reservation* (saith M. Parsons) *may be what a man list to say to himselfe.* Now their *Priest*, who listeth not be apprehended, will list to frame to himselfe such a crotchetiue conceit, which shall goe as inuisible as an Angell of darkenes, by whom it is hatched: As for example, to say, *I am no Priest*, (meaning,) *That euer worshipped the Idoll Bell*: or, *I am no Priest*, (meaning) *whom you loue*: or, *I am no Priest*, (meaning,) *That is willing to be hanged*: or, *I am no Priest*, (meaning,) *that can tell fortunes*: or, *I am not a Priest*, (meaning,) *whose name is Cutbert*: or, *I am not a Priest*, (meaning,) *for ought that you shall know.* Thus then seeing that the reserved Clause may be according to *M. Parsons* doctrine, whatsoever a man list to fancie, so that it agree with his minde, although it be not implied in the outward words, it is as infinitely variable, and therefore as certainly vnsearchable, as are the fancies and thoughts of men, which onely God can see, iudge, and reuenge.

M. Parsons
grosse igno-
rance disco-
uered in the
very state of
the question.

36 Knowing therefore that the Equiuocations, which haue beene objected by *M. Parsons* out of Scriptures, are not properly *Mentall*, but *Verball*, because the meanings which he calleth *Reservations*, were implied in the words of those sentences, and in the circumstances thereof; but the reservation, which *M. Parsons* professeth and we condemne, is an onely *mentall reservation*, which hath no more affinity in sence with the outward words, than this; *I am no Priest*, (meaning,) *like a Goose that goeth bare-foote*; so that he that from the hearing of the first part, which was the outward speech, could haue but coniectured at that reserved meaning of a *Goose*, might passe for a *Magnus Apollo*. I shall referre this first point, concerning the palpabilitie of *Romish reservation* vnto the wisdome & iudgement of our

Reader, to award the note of foolery vnto whether of vs it shall seeme, in his discretion, more iustly to appertaine. The second thing, which I promised to shew, is the impietie of the same doctrine.

CHAP. XI.

*A discovery of the impietie of their pretences for Men-
tall Equiuocation. First prouing it to be a lye.*

§. I.

IN the former Sections hath beene vnfolded the grosse absurdities of *M. Parsons* his proofes (which he presumed to collect out of Scripture) in so copious and perspicuous a maner, as that I might feare the imputation of some folly, for prosecuting of such fooleries with so great seriousnessse. Therefore now my present induour must be to shew his defence to be no lesse gracelesse, then it is sencelesse, the impietie whereof becommeth so much the more notorious and execrable, as it durst more boldly seekere refuge at Gods sanctuary euen the holy Scripture, and there to catch hold at the examples of *Christ* his speeches, as it were at the hornes of the Altar. But I haue done my best to pull it from that hould, by the ioynt helpe of their owne Doctores; and now am I to pursue and to demonstrate the impieties of the foresaid defence, drawing all into these two generall heads. The first is in respect of the cause it selfe, to proue it an Art of *lying*, and the second is in respect of the *Cases*, which issue from thence: to shew them to be dangerous and vniust.

M. PARSONS Mitigation.

*He saith out of Saint Augustine, that we may not leane off
truth to be lye, as the Priscillianists did; which appertaineth
nothing*

nothing to our purpose: for they intended to confirme the lawfulness of lying out of the words of Christ, which we doe not; but shew out of Christs speech, when he said John 15. All things whatsoever I haue had of my Father, haue I made knowne vnto you,] he did not lye, or falsifie at all, but reserved somewhat in his minde not uttered, which ioyned with the words, make the proposition most true. * Meaning by [Whatsoever] * Par. 372. whatsoever he thought conuenient.

The Reuiew, prouing M. PARSONS his
Reservation a lye.

1 Their Card. * To let doth acknowledge the general = In John 15. Rule of interpreting such speeches, to wit, of Interpreting such generall propositions of Scripture, by restraining them vnto the circumstances of things, whereof they are spoken, as of the persons, the time, and the scope, and end of which they are spoken: So here, in reuealing all things to his Disciples, it must be understood, all which might concerne them, as they were now Disciples, and which were necessary for their present State. But the Priestly Reservation is without all compasse of due circumstance, being (as M. Parsons saith) whatsoever it pleaseth a man to fancie to himselfe, so that it agreeth with his minde. And so this mixt proposition must goe for current; viz. *I am no Priest*, (reseruing in minde) for ought that you shall know: where he answereth, as though he would let a man know that he is no Priest, and yet reserueth in his mind, that he will not be knowne, whether he be a Priest, or no: is there any circumstance of time, or place, or person, that can sensibly or reasonably imply any such reserved sence? Certainly no more, then if he had answered thus; *I am no Priest*, (concealing in his minde,) for ought that you know: or, *I am not a Priest* (meaning secretly,) that wanteth a nose. If M. Parsons, or all the subtilists Equiuocators themselues should hunt by all circumstances that are, to find this reservation of a Nose, I suppose that they could neuer smell it out. Wherefore I now proceede to my purpose.

The

The proofes to shew the *Mentall Reservation* to be a *lye*, by the iudgement of all kind of Professors: and first by their owne Doctores.

3 We haue often heard what kinde of *Mentall Equiuocation* *M. Parsons* doth patronize, viz. *Any mixt proposition partly deliuered with mouth, and partly conceined in minde; so that the reserved clause doe agree with my minde, be it whatsoever I please to fancie to my selfe.*

^a See above lib. 1. cap. 13. § 2. 4 First this kinde of Equiuocating hath bene condemned for a *lye* by their owne *Sepulveda*, who produceth, for confirmation of his assertion, most ancient *Divines* (as he calleth them) citing by name *Aquinas*, *Scotus*, *Henricus*, and *Gabriel*.

5 After him approacheth their Iesuit *Azorius*, & where-as *M. Parsons* professeth such a *Mentall Equiuocation*, wherein the speech hath a double sence, not by the signification, or composition of the words themselves, but onely by some reservation in the minde; * He (the foresaid Iesuit) proclaimeth that every vse of words in any sence, which they haue not in themselves, is a *lye*: And after iumping vpon the same example of Reservation, which *M. Parsons* vsed and vtged for proofof *Mentall Equiuocation*, to wit, *When I am asked of one, who is no good pay-master, whether I haue so much money, or no, I may answere (though I haue it) No, (with this Reservation) to lend it vnto you: this their said Iesuit doth contrarily call a flat lie.*

[†] See *ibid.*

6 *Emanuel* * Sa another Iesuit followed *Azor*, but yet so haltingly, as though he had had a thorne in his heele, and was afraid to confesse a truth; being but halfe of that opinion. Therefore I opnie him, and seeke after [†] *Scotus*, who commeth on more resolutely to the point, calling this speech [*I know not* (mixed with this restriction and Reservation) *To tell it you*] an arrant *lye*: And concerning *Amphibologies* vsed in words, which the outward words themselves will not beare, he concludeth them to be no-way excusable

fable from *lies*. Can there be a greater impietie, than to bring Christ his speeches for the authorizing and patronizing of such *clauses of reservation*, which their owne approved Doctors and professors haue condemned for starke *lies*?

Secondly, by Fathers.

7 Among Christians I held *S. Augustine* most singular, (yet when I name him, I imply also *S. Gregorie*, and *S. Bernard*, who follow him in his booke *Contra Mendacium*:) *fact. p. 3. p. 80.*
 He supposing some old man To be dangerously sicke, who if he should but heare of the death of his Sonne, were like to *perill* his owne life; yet so it is that his servant, who knoweth that his sonne is dead, is earnestly demanded to tell him the state where-
part 3. pag. 65. out of S. Aug. lib. contra mendacium cap. 18.
 in his sonne is, whether he be deade, or alive, what shall the servant answer in this case? he must answer (saith *S. Augustine*)
 either that he is a lye, or dead, or else say that he knoweth not; but to say that he knoweth, or knoweth not are both false, and the onely true answer is that his sonne is dead. From this determination of *S. Augustine* I made bold to collect, that if ever *S. Augustine* had thought *Memall Equivocation* (as namely to say this *Your sonne is a lye*, Reserving in minde, for ought that you shall yet know) he wrould surely haue allowed of it in this Case, especially seeing that thereby he might both haue freed the old Father from dying, and his owne tongue from lying. It were good that we heard *P. R.* his Answer vnto this.

M. PARSONS his Answer.

To this I answer, that this case is not like those, for that here is no iust demand, no force, no compulsion, no injury offered, and consequently no right of using such evasion for iust defence, for so much as this is in common conversation, from which we haue exempted before the use of Equivocations, albeit we haue heard also out of the same *S. Aug. himselfe*, *Aliud est mentiri, aliud*
Min. pag. 460. 461.

veritatem celare. It is one thing to lye, and another thing to
conceal a truth without lying. S. Auguſt. ſpeaketh againſt the
firſt; and ſo doe we, and conſequently this example prometh na-
thing.

The Reply.

^a See above l. 1. 8 Onoble Answerer he that taught the uſe of *Mentall*
Cap. 13. num. 29 *Reſervation*, in Caſe when a man *Asketh* whether his friend
have ſo much money (where there is onely a demand without
compulſion,) for feare of getting his diſpleaſure, if he ſhould
have directly denied him that ſumme, would now ſeeme not
to admit of the like evaſion in the Caſe of a ſervant com-
manded to answer directly concerning the death of his ma-
ſters ſonne, where there is more then a doubt of ſhortning
his maſters life. Who ſeeth not that *M. Parſons* if he had
returned a direct answer, doth now cough birdlime, wherein
the more he ſtruggleth, the more he is intangled, answering
nothing to the purpoſe? For the queſtion is not, whether it
be lawfull to *Conceal* a truth, but whether this manner of co-
nieting it, by *Mentall reſervation*, be tollerable, or no; which
S. Auguſtines wit gaue him not ſo much as to dreame of,
whoſe ſanctity, doubtleſſe, would have called it craft and
impieety; whoſe definition of a lye is this, *Mendacium eſt*
faſſum dicere, cum voluntate fallendi, that is, *A lye is to ſpeake*
a falſe thing with purpoſe to deceive the hearer. I pretermite

^a Full ſatisfact. another memorable example, repeated by *S. Aug.* of the
part. 3. pag. 66. Biſhop *Firminus*, which hath bene alleadged by their So-
^b See above l. 2. *cap. 3. num. 6.* *ſeruation*, for the confutation of the foreſaid manner of *Mentall Re-*

^c Part. 3. pag. 102. ^d Tom. 1. de anim. lura ſepius illa.
9 In the laſt end of the booke of *Full ſatisfact.* I added
to the like purpoſe an example delivered by *S. Hierome*,
which may be vnto vs a mirror of ancient ſimplicitie; Of a
wiſe accuſed by her husband, and tortured to draw out a confeſ-
ſion of guilt: but ſhe liſting up her eyes to heauen, ſaid, thou
Lord Jeſu, who ſearcheth the hart and reins, art witneſſe that
I doe not deny truth for feare of death, but therefore reſuſe to
lye

lye for feare of sinne. The Iesuits, who haue instructed the adulterous wife, being asked of her husband, to free herself by a *Mentall Equiuocation*, would they not haue condemned this woman for want of wit, and haue giuen her other ghostly counsell, teaching her the vse of the same Art, for the auoyding of death, and escaping a lye? May we not guesse by the constancie of this godly woman, & by S. Hieroms commendations of her, that those times were not practiced in this kinde of Alchymie, which abstracteth such a *Clause of Reseruation*, as surpasseth the vnderstanding of any, but of him who onely is able to search immediately into the thoughts and vnderstandings of men? as when a man saith *I haue no money*, concealing this Clause in his minde, *Which I meane to turne into buttons.* The example of this woman may seeme to be more forcible, because *M. Parsons* in his *Treatise of Equiuocation*, in answering some other points, buried this in his sober silence.

Thirdly, by Heretikes.

10 We reade in S. *Augustine* of the heresie of the *Priscillianistes*, who were herein (as he saith) *worse then any other Heretikes*, because they thought it lawfull for them to dissemble themselves to be Orthodoxe and true professors and to conceale their owne Religion by lying: and for prooffe that it was lawfull to *lye*, they vsed to alleadge the example of *Patriarkes, Prophets, Apostles, and the speeche of Christ himselfe*. *Nec se aliud arbitantes (saith S. Aug.) veracem suam ostendere falsitatem, nisi veritatem dicant mendacem; that is, They thought that they could not defend their falsitie, vnlesse they taught that truth it selfe was a lye.* Let now our iudicious Reader but thinke with himselfe, seeing that *lying* was condemned of all other professions, as well Catholikes, as Heretikes; whether the *Priscillianists* would haue vsed *lying*, for the Couert of their hereticall religion, knowing that the Art of Equiuocating by a *mentall proposition*, called *Mentall Reseruation*, is as close and inuisible a conueiance

Aug. contra mendacium, ad Consent. panis post initium.

for any thing that a man would hide, as the most diabolically lye that man can inuent? As for example, by protesting vnto the hearers, saying, *We beleene no such doctrine secretly conceiuing in their mindes, to let you know of it: or, we beleene as you doe*, Reseruing this Clause in their minde, *But that we doe not beleene you*.

² Contra Mendac.

11 We are to adde vnto this the practise of *Consentius*, and some other erroneous ones, who albeir they were faithfull professors, yet, that they might discouer the *Priscillianists*, who for feare did secretly professe the heresie of *Priscillian*, and yet publicly renounced it, holding it lawfull in that case to lye; did *Cretizare cum Cretensibus*, and held it lawfull by lying to winde out these lyers; to the which purpose they dissembled themselves to be *Priscillianists*. These erroneous ones are vehemently condemned by *S. Augustine*, as those who *Did euill, that good might come thereof*. The discouery of Heretikes he calleth good, but to doe it by lying, herearmeth euill. They saw no other meanes to vnearth these Cubbes of that Heretike *Priscillian*, but only by dissembling, and lying; Neuerthelesse *S. Aug.* pleadeth for syncerity thus, *Veritate occidenda mendacia*, teaching that *lies are not to be slaine, but by the truth*. But O the wit of our Equiuocators! they would haue corrected *S. Augustine*, and directed those erroneous, and taught them (if the Case would suffer it) how to dissemble themselves to be *Priscillianists* without lying, and yet with as faire a subletie, as the most profound lying that can be imagined; and that is, by *Mentall Reseruation*, as thus; *To say that we are Priscillianists, Reseruing in our minds, for ought that you shall know, or, We are Priscillianists, reseruing in our mindes, Only in pretence that we may betray you, or such like*. Doth not their want of this kind of Euation tell vs that *Consentius*, and those other erroneous, although otherwise faithfull Christians, (who did by lying seeke to finde out lyars,) either were ignorant of this mysterie of *Mentall Equiuocation*, or els held it to be no better then plaine lying.

12 What shall we say vnto the Arch-heretike *Arius*? he
(as

(as I² then deliuered out of ^a Socrates) being compelled by ^{Full satisfact.} the holy Emperor Constantine to deliuer his Subscription to the Councell of Nice, and to anouch His integritie by an oath; he ^{part. 3. pag 91.} used this Art and sleight; his owne (hereticall) opinion he closely kept vnder his left arme; and then swore (laying his hand vpon his left side) that he so beleued, as he had written. Here we may obserue that this execrable Heretike vsed openly a Verball Equiuocation, which although it be not an absolute lye, (as ^{See above.} hath beene shewen) yet could not the vse thereof, in dissembling the true faith, be but most sacrilegious and abhominable: Notwithstanding, he making conscience (as it seemeth) of a lye, rather answered by a Verball ambiguitie, then tolde directly that he beleued the Article of that Councell. We are to marke, that the whole obscuritie was in the double sence of the word, *Writing*, for that he had written one tenor of Confession, which he propounded openly vnto the Councell; and another had he written, which he kept closely vnder his arme-hole, and by vertue of that Verball Equiuocation he made his euasion. I would but therefore demande why this godlesse and perfidious Heretike should haue taken the paines in inuenting and writing a contrary forme of Subscription, and to keepe it about him, (which by a priuie search might haue been discovered) if it had been knowne in those daies that a Mental Reseruati-
tion would haue serued the turne, to auoyde a lye; especially seeing that by vertue hereof he should not haue needed either to straine his wit for inuention of a Verball Equiuocation, nor stir his hand, for putting it in *writing*: because he could not haue wanted many secret and vnssearchable Reseruati-
ons, as his fancies, which may be called *Mille Artifices*, would haue presented to his thoughts, which are innumerable, among others, this; to haue said to the Councell, *I beleuee that, which I haue there written*, (vnderstanding in his mind) *That it is false*. Here is the mixt proposition, which by M. Parsons learning must be as true now, being partly uttered, and partly reserved, as if it had beene wholly expressed in the outward words, which I haue proued to be an execrable

² See above.
¹ See above.

lye, both by ¹ Reason, and by the ¹ Confession of their owne Doctors; and now euince the same from the practizes euen of these Heretikes, viz. the *Priscillianists*, and this *Arius*, they defending *lying*, for want of other meanes to hide his heresie, this other vling onely the dangerous and discouerable *Verball Equiuocation*, for feare of *lying*: And therefore (if I be not deceiued) doe both beare witnesse that the Iesui-call Art of *Mentall Reseruation* was either not knowne in those daies, or else knowne to be no better then meere lying.

Fourthly, by Pagans.

13 *M. Parsons* was earnestly intreated, yea and challenged to produce out of the Schooles of all Pagans and Heathens, of what sect soeuer (who were, for number, infinite and, for naturall light, and learning excelling the children of light) that did expressly acknowledge any Truth in his mixt proposition, by a *Mentall Reseruation*, as for example, thus: If one shall promise to his Keeper, that he will be true prisoner, not to *run away*, (meaning,) *on his head*: Seeing *M. Parsons* (I say) was extremely prouoked to alleadge but one testimonie out of the innumerable Authors that haue written either Ethicks, Logick, or Metaphysicks, who euer iustified this mungrell kinde of proposition, yet could he not instance in any one, excepting onely in *Cicero*, who notwithstanding speaketh onely of such a speech, which he himselfe calleth *false*, and is indeede as *false*, as is this promise, *I will pay you money*, meaning secretly, *that I will not pay it*, which the Romanists themselves will graunt to be a foule lye.

² See above
 Lib 2. cap. 4.

14 How then shall it not be held an impietie, to make *Christ* a Patrone of that kinde of *Reseruation*, which when it seemed to be most needefull, yet was not acknowledged for a trath by so worthy and learned Christians, by so great Heretikes, by so innumerable Pagans, and lastly by diuerse learned Romanists themselves: Thus much concerning the *Impiety of Mentall Reseruation* naturally inheren in it selfe.

In

In the last place we are to point at some accidentall impieties, which, by reason of some *Cases*, and *Effects*, doe incidentally follow thereupon.

SECT. 2.

A further evidence of the *Impiety* of the doctrine of *Mentall Reservation* by the *Cases*, and some *Effects*, which incidentally follow vpon it.

First of a few *Cases*.

M. PARSONS his Appendix.

EXcept they will condemn our Saviour himselfe of all these Reason. p. 687.
obscured impieties, they cannot condemn the manner of speech used by him, especially in so grave and weighty matters: and if they permit the same in him, then can they not condemn the same in vs, who have so good a warrant and president for the same, especially seeing we doe restrain our use thereof with many limitations; as in our Larger Treatise of that matter is set downe, to wit, that it may not be used in matters of Religion, where confession of our faith is required. * Among Cases referred, Con- * Mitig. p. 348.
fession of faith is exprest, and in the first place excepted.

The review.

15 Often haue I distinguished betweene M. Parsons his *Verb*all, and *Mentall* Equivocation, the first is when the words themselves carry in them a double sense, according to the use of speech; as that saying of Christ (obscured by M. Parsons) wherein he said vnto the Iewes, * Dissolve you this Temple, speaking of his body, and I will raise it up againe in three daies: the ambiguity lieth in the double sense of these words, Dissolve this Temple, which might signifie either the
ruinating

* Mitig. p. 347
* Job. 2. 19.

Col. 2.

1 See 1. Cor. 3.

16. & 6. & 2.

Cor. 6. 16. Phil.

3 23.

2. Tim. 4. 6. &

2. Cor. 5. 1.

† Maiden vpon

this place.

† Iansen, Con-

cord. vpon the

place.

† Tolet vpon

this place.

† Matth. 26.

ruinating of the materiall Temple, out of which *Christ* cast the money-changers, and so the Iewes vnderstood it; or els *Christ*'s owne body, metaphorically called a *Temple*, because the [†] *Deity dwells in it bodily*, and naturally; which was said to be *dissolved*, because death is a dissolution: and so *Christ* meant it: which albeit it was not vnderstood of the hearers, yet was it vnderstandable and intelligible; First because the phrase of calling a body a *Temple*, and of death a *Dissolution*, was familiar vnto the religious of those times, which therefore we find to be so ordinarily ysed in [†] *Scripture*: in somuch that their Iesuit [†] *Maldomate* saith that *Christ*, in saying, *Dissolve this Temple*, ysed words which agreed better vnto an humane body, than vnto the fabrickes of the other temple, because to dissolve and to raise againe are more agreeable to the body, when the bond of the Soule of man is burst in sunder, &c. Yea *Christ* his body (saith [†] *Iansenius*) was more properly a *Temple*, because the temple was but a figure of his body. And they might haue vnderstood him, if they would, (saith their Cardinall [†] *Tolet*) because when he said, *This Temple*, (and not the Temple of God) it is certaine that by the gesture of his hand he did demonstrate his owne body: words are better determinated by outward gestures and signes, than by *Scripture*. So he. And there is reason for it, for if they could not haue vnderstood it, then had not their Accusation against *Christ* beene a slander, when they laid this saying against him, thus; [†] *This man said, I can destroy the Temple of God, and build it vp in three daies*; For the which these (because of their peruerse sence) are called *false witnesses*. But the *Mentall* Equiuocation may haue such a sequestred and reserued a meaning, as by no circumstance of speech can be made intelligible, as this: *I am no Priest*, meaning, *Who can be unknowne to God*. This is that kinde of *Mentall Reseruatiō* and euasiō which *M. Parsons* alloweth, concerning which he professeth that it may not be ysed in matters of faith, & yet pretendeth to euince it from *Scripture*, which is the Rule of our Faith; and from the speeches of *Christ*, the Author of our Faith; and sometimes in such sentences, which concerne Articles of Faith, as in that:

† He

* He that obserueth my word, shall neuer see death, and such like. * See aboue,

16 And here I appeale vnto the indifferencie of any iudicious Reader, to iudge, whether *M. Parsons* be not guiltie of the folly and impiety, which I had laid vnto his charge, by the force of this distinction, of a sence *Implied* in speeches, & a sence absolutely *Reserued in the minde*: the first kinde I graunt to be, if he will, more then a thousand times vsed in Scripture; but the second of his maner of *Reserued* could neuer finde any *Iota* in all Scripture, to countenance so vile a deuice. Which although I haue confuted by many Reasons, yet now I will aduenture to turne his owne weapon vpon him. First thus:

17 If the *Reseruation*, which he defendeth, be not to be piously and lawfully vsed in matters of faith, then was it an impietie in him, to ground the truth of that doctrin vpon sentences of Scripture, which concerne the doctrine of faith. Secondly thus:

18 If I should passe through all the Articles of our Creed, to search such kind of *Reservations*, as *M. Parsons* did in the speeches of *Christ*, as namely thus, first 1. meaning *I*, a man, & not a woman, 2. *Beleeue*, meaning truly, and not fainedly; 3. *in God*, meaning the God of Christians, & not the Idoll of the Pagans; 4. *the Father*, meaning, by adoption, and not by naturall generation; 5. *Almighty*, meaning, that can doe whatsoeuer he will, not that will doe whatsoeuer he can; 6. *maker of heauen, and earth*, meaning, with his word, & not with any hands: so might I passe throughout euery Article of our Christian Creed, to collect from euery ioynt, & word therof, all such like vnexpressed meanings, as *M. Parsons* did from the speeches of *Christ*.

19 Here I may arguethus: If all such sentences, which according to the custome and vse imply meanings, which are not expresse, do exemplifie and proue the Romish *Mentall Equiuocation*, then is there a *Mentall Reseruation* in euery Article of our Faith; and so it is vnpossible but to Equiuocate *mentally* in the Confession of our Faith. But if these implied senses do differ from the Romish *reserued sence*, then was it both wicked & absurd, to seeke to draw that exorbitant and inapprehensible doctrine of *Equiuocating*, from such sentences of Scripture which are no more Equiuocall, then be the doctrines of our Faith.

20 The second Case is in the examination concerning their

Priesthood, where the Priest being asked, *Whether he be a Priest*, is licensed to answer, according to their daily practize, saying; *I am no Priest*, with this Reservation, *as purposing to tell it you*. Now then, knowing that they hold ordination of Priesthood to be a Sacrament, which impresseth in the soule an *indelible Character*, & which herein (as they say) *excelleth all other Sacraments*, in that it *aduanceth a Priest a degree above all other Christians*; the end whereof they make a reall Offering up of Christ as a *Sacrifice for the quicke and the dead*; I tooke vpon me to argue, in effect, thus: Seeing euery Christian will hold it to be an impietie to Equiuocate in denying his Baptisme, therefore may hee iudge it likewise a wickednes for a Priest to Equiuocate in denying his Priest-dome. Vnto which I expected an Answer of *M. Parsons*; but only expected it. From *Cases* we passe to *Effects*.

Full Satisfact.
part. 3. pag. 92.

The Impious Effects of the new kind of Romish Mentall Equiuocation. The first effect.

21 The first is, because if this kind of Equiuocating be admitted, mans mouth is stopped for giuing either man, or deuill the lye, because still they may answer, that they did not lye, for that they conceived a secret vnsearchable Clause of Reservation in their minde: as when he said vnto *Eue*, Gen. 3. *Though you eat, you shall not die*, reseruing secretly (that we may suppose thus much) dye *Martyrs*, or die *Eating*, or dye *In your beds*, or what not? *M. Parsons* perceiuing the cōsequence, returned an Answer.

M. PARSONS his Mitigation.

Mitigat. p. 456. *This is childish: And is not this goodly stufte? fit for a booke? fit for print? are these suffered to passe without controlement in England? If the Deuill be the Father of lyes, and consequently of them that doe lye, of what kinde will he proue to be to this Minister, that hath beene taken now with so many notorious lyes? &c.*

The Reuiew.

22 Thus he runneth on with a personall and vnconscionable Inuectiue against me, euen vnto the end of the Paragraph; not yeelding one Syllable, in Answer to the point of Argument. It may be he would haue said something, if he had not run himselfe

selfe out of breath; or else *Aquila non capit muscas*, he held it to be too *Childish*, and vnworthy his Answering: I am rather perswaded that he perceiued the full force thereof, which must be this, viz. That if this new maner of *Mentall Equiuocation* may be once got by hart of people, and serue to make a speech true, no man shall haue any neede of a *lye*, for couert of any guilt, because this *Mentall* euasion will be both as easie, and as secure as any *lye*; & consequently he shall be accounted the *lyar*, that shall giue any other the *lye*. I suppose my Reader will hold this to be an Argument, yea and peraduenture so forcible, that the prouerbe may be inuerted against *M. Parsons*, as thus, *Musca non capit Aquilas*; and therefore made he a shift to controule that, which he could not confute. Which will be apparant by the next point.

The second Effect.

23 Periury being generally held to be a *lye in an Oath*, it must follow that the same Clause of secret *Reseruation*, which freeth a man from lying, may deliuer him also from the brand of Periury, and so shall neuer any, who is experienced in this maner of Equiuocating, be possibly condemned of periurie, whatsoeuer the words be, that he vttereth with his mouth: And so the witnesses, which were suborned against true *Naboth*, and against chaste *Susanna*, and against the *Iust one*, yea and against very Iustice it selfe our Lord *Christ*, (supposing that they knew the tricke of Equiuocation) could not be absolutely condemned of Periurie; And so all Tribunals must cancell, and extinguish the Title of *Periury*, in their proceeding against vniust witnesses. This also I^e held to haue in it some pith of an Argument, but *M. Parsons* would not so much as mention it; It may be he con-
* Full Satisf.
 pars. 3. pag. 96.
 temned it.

The third Effect.

24 Again Iesuits and other Priests are not all soule, as we may guesse by their doctrine of *Equiuocating*, which they profess for the safety & security of their owne bodies, one branch of which doctrine is this: *When any is put upon the racke*, (saith their Cardinall, & sometime Iesuit, among his general instructions,
* Toles Inf. &
 Card. lib. 5.
 Instruct. Sacer.
 cap. 66.

ons, which he giueth vnto Priests) and doth reueale the crime of an other, althoug he be not examined iustly and according to law, yet herein he doth not sinne, because none is bound vpon so great bodily harme to himselfe, to preserve the good name of an other. Therefore (said ^b I) whenas you make all Protestant Magistrates Incompetent, with whom you thinke it lawfull to Equiuocate in your speeches & oathes, when you are questioned about other men, you doe, in effect, teach your Aduersaries to vse that extremitie with you, as though the onely competent Examiner of you must be the Rack. This Argument *M. Parsons* saw, but yet onely saw it; and what maruell? for guilty persons are not willing to come neare to the Rack.

^b Full satisfact.
part. 3 pag. 99.

The fourth Effect.

^c Treatise,
cap. 10.

25 This I noted to be the prophanation of an Oath, the end whereof is thus described by the B. Apostle, *Heb. 6. 16. Men verily sweare by him that is greater,* (meaning, God) *and an Oath for confirmation is among them an end of Strife:* shewing that the consecrated End of an Oath is for such a Confirmation, as may make an end of Contention. But the Manuscript ^c Treatise of Mentall Equiuocation maintained, that a party examined, if he be vrged to sweare that which he ought not, that then he may sweare, but with a secret intention of Equiuocation; and if he be further vrged to sweare without all Equiuocation, he may sweare That he doth not Equiuocate, by a third Equiuocation, or Reservation; and so on, as often as he shall be asked the like question. Here we see allowed Equiuocation vpon Equiuocation, as it were Cogge vpon Cogge; which doctrine once professed is so farre from making an End of Contention, that indeed it maketh it endlesse, because all men, who are instructed in this Art, being partiall in their own Causes, may, by multiplying his Reservations, delude his hearer, and leaue him in a perpetuall suspence and doubt, that whatsoeuer the swearer protesteth in outward speech, may through a Mentall Reservation proue as deceitfull, as was *Indas* his *All-haile*. *M. Parsons* answereth both to the relation of the testimonie, and also to the Consequence taken from thence.

M.

M. PARSONS his Mitigation.

I doubt not but T. M. hath egregiously abused, both this and Mitigat. p 479.
other places, in the Catholike M. S. Treatise, against which he In answer to
writeth, by setting downe certaine palpable absurdities, which is the argument
impossible should be there, as he setteth them downe: which I must taken frō the
presume of, untill I finde contrary, by viewing that Treatise it selfe, End of an oath.
which I shortly hope for. objected in
 the Full Satisf.
 satisf. part. 3.
 pag. 88.

The Review.

26 Marke (good Reader) and maruell with me at this mans
 wit; he will seeme now to grant that it were a *palpable absurdity*,
 and *impossibilitie*, to teach a man sometime to sweare, by mul-
 tiplying *Equiuocation upon Equiuocation*, when he is vrged ther-
 unto; and therefore will onely be thought to suspect, that I
 haue abused *M. Garnets Treatise*, by misreporting his directi-
 on, which I alleadged most faithfully. And for my iustification
 herein I appeale vnto *M. Parsons* himselfe in the same booke of
Mitigation, wherein a little before the end (pag. 553.) he con-
 fesseth saying; *And now at this very Instant commeth to my hands*
this Catholike Treatise it selfe of Equiuocation before mentioned.
 So he. And now that it is come to his hands, doth he charge me
 with *abuse* of the Auther, by misciting the foresaid sentence?
 no truely, he doth not challenge me for any one falsification, in
 relating of it, or any other testimony out of that *Treatise*; which
 may seeme not to need our Censure, seeing the eyes euen of this
 great Proctor for *Equiuocation* can discern in it *palpable absur-*
dities. Thus much of the Relation of that sentence. Now con-
 cerning the Consequence taken from thence.

M. PARSONS his Mitigation.

The end of an Oath, which is to put an end of contention, is not hin- Mitigat. p 479.
dred by the use of an Equiuocation, when law permitteth the same.

The Review.

27 Law neuer permitte:h any such guilefull *Equiuocation* part. 3. pag. 87.
 in an *Oath*, as was ^d proued both out of their old Schoole by the ^d *Aquinas* 2. 2.
 testimony of *Lombard*, but especially of ^{q. 69. art. 1.} *Aquinas*. If a *Iudge* ^{arg. 1.}
 require

require any thing (saith he) which he cannot by order of Law, the party accused is not bound to answer, but either by Appeale, or by some other maner of meanes may deliuer himselfe: But in no case may he tell a lye, or vse falshood, nor any kind of craft or deceit, &c

M. PARSONS his Mitigation.

Mitigat. pag.
478. 479.

This is plainly to be understood, when a Iudge is competent, and proceedeth competently, otherwise when he proceedeth not according to the forme of law, &c. And a little after. And in this very place of S. Thomas Aquinas the said Doctors words are, that if a Iudge, though otherwise lawfull, shall require any thing, which by order of law he cannot, the party accused is not bound to answer at all (and much lesse directly to his meaning) but may either by Appeale or by other meanes deliuer himselfe by enasion, though he may not speake a lye. So S. Thomas. And what wise man doth not see, that this maketh quite against Tho. Morton? first, if it be lawfull to the defendant not to answer at all euen to a lawfull & competent Iudge, when he proceedeth not according to forme of law, then much lesse is he bound to answer or sweare directly to his intencion in that Case; but may vse any lawfull enasion, by doubtfull speech, or otherwise, which is directly against our Aduersaries conclusion: so little doth he discern when he alleageth authorities flatly against himselfe.

The Reuiew.

28 If this Answer of M. Parsons make not flatly against him, then shall I thinke it no iniury, that hee put me in his vile Reasoning of fallhoods. The Testimonie of Aquinas was produced to proue, that although a man may refuse to sweare, where he seeth great inconuenience; yet whensoever he doth sweare, yea although it be before an vnlawfull Magistrate proceeding vniustly against vs, (because in our Oath we are to respect rather God, by whom we sweare, then man, vnto whom we sweare) we are bound in conscience to auoyd that Equiuocating trick, for feare of profaning his sacred name. M. Parsons answereth in generall vnto this foresaid Testimony of T. Aquinas, and the sentences of some others, that we are chargeable to auoyd subtilty in swearing, when the lawfull Iudge proceedeth competently, that is, lawfully; when as, indeed, the very words of Thomas, (as both

I alleadged them, and as *M. Parsons* himsele doth relate them) *M. Parsons* his stand thus: *If a Iudge, though otherwise lawfull, shall require any palpable thing, which he cannot by order of law, then &c.* That which is not truly done by order of law, is not done (as every one knoweth) competently, as *M. Parsons* answereth, but incompetently.

29 Secondly; for my better warrant, I had the confession of their owne *Genesius Sepulveda*, who speaking of the same testimony of *Aquinas*, & speaking professedly against their *Equivocators* maner of Equivocating, saith; *Could Thomas more plainly deny their opinion, who teach that a guilty person may avoid a true accusation by Art of words? M. Parsons* resolueth contrarily. *If a Iudge proceed not lawfully, in exacting an oath, then he that sweareth may sweare to his own, and not to the intention of the Iudge.* We may now perceiue, that *M. Parsons* hath answered *Thomas* so aduersely, as if he ment to haue blowen in his face. I hasten to the last Effect.

Genesius Sepulveda in Theoph. c. 18. & Misig. p. 478.

The last Effect.

30 If my Reader require a more full satisfaction in this question of *Mentall Equivocation*, he shall need but to consult with some former Sections of this Encounter in the first booke, cap. 4. there is the hunting out of this Fox; in the cap. 10. the Confessions of *Sepulveda*, *Azorius*, and others: In this second booke and cap. 3. the Confession of *Sotus*; and cap. 4. the opinion of *Cicero*; and c. 14. the iudgment of *Maldonate*: All these largely discussed.

31 The last Effect is the infamy, which redoundeth vnto the professed *Equivocators*, both in their speeches, and in their books: for there is no doubt but *M. Parsons* and his fellowes, who durst seek to iustifie their *Mentall Equivocation* by *Scriptures* (the writings of the holy Ghost) will not spare to Equivocate in their owne writings, either for the discrediting of their Aduersaries; or for the couert of their owne deformities; or else for the speedier advancement of their cause; presuming that although they report and professe some things, which in outward words are meereley false; and may by their outward sound helpe forward, to the building vp of the Romish Church, yet that in such cases they ought to mortifie their falshoods of the outward speech with their exorbitant, secret, reserved, & inapprehensible conceits

conceits: And then what credence may such writers expect of their Readers?

h Aug. contra mundac. cap. 4.

32 *S. August.* writing against some professors of the true religion, & yet in one point so far erroneous, as to thinke that they might dissemble themselves to be heretikes, only to the end that they might, by lying, more easily discover those Heretikes, called *Priscilianists*, who concealed their heresie by lying, and by pretending that they were Orthodoxe and Catholikes; He reasoneth the matter thus: *Thou wilt say (saith he) that I therefore lie, that I may catch a liar, viz. The Priscilianist: Then hee maketh the Priscilianists to answer saying: But how shall I know whether thou do it rather least thou shouldst be catched of me. By & by S. Augustine returneth to the Orthodoxe; Can he perswade a man (saith he) that he will not lie, that he be not catched himselfe; who lieth that he may catch another? Doest thou not perceiue whereunto this euill practise doth lead, to wit, that both they may seeme to be worthily suspected of vs, and we of them, and every one of each another; and so it shall come to passe, that whilst that our belief is taught by lying, no man shall know whom to beleue? Which reward of not being beleued is of all men most due vnto Murtherers, Equiuocators, such as teach men to say to their friends, I haue no money, meaning, to lend it vnto you; and to their Aduersaries, I am no Priest, meaning, with purpose to tell it vnto you, &c. which speeches, when their Cases happen to be truely knownen, to wit, that the one had money, and the other was a Priest, doe carry nothing else in their outward sound (which onely can be vnderstood of man) but the euident apparance of a lie, and are indeed, in themselves, (as hath beene both prooued and confessed) no better than flat lies; yet could *M. Parsons* haue no other remedies, whereby to mortifie his manifold vntruthes, which vniustly & vnconscionably he did heap vpon me: Notwithstanding, I doe earnestly pray, if he be yet aliuie; or if he be dead, I wish that such his Calumniationes be neuer laid vnto his charge.*

Laud Deo.

f
y
t
-
y
e
e
e
e
f
h
w
t
l,
o
e
e
i